

Forty-Fifth
Anniversary Conference

National Association
of
Student Personnel
Administrators

Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

June 25-28, 1963

P R O C E E D I N G S

PORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS

Officers of the Association

President	J. C. Clevenger, Dean of Students, Washington State University
President Designate	James C. McLeod, Dean of Students, Northwestern University
Vice President	John P. Gwin, Dean of Students, Beloit College
Vice President	Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J., Vice President of Student Personnel, Fordham University
Vice President Designate.	Glen T. Nygreen, Dean of Students, Kent State University
Vice President Designate.	Mark Smith, Dean of Men, Denison University
Secretary-Treasurer	Carl W. Knox, Dean of Men, University of Illinois
Conference Chairman	O. D. Roberts, Dean of Men, Purdue University

Executive Committee: The Officers and

Fred H. Weaver	Secretary of the University of North Carolina
John L. Blackburn	Dean of Men, University of Alabama
Thomas L. Broadbent	Dean of Students, University of California
R. William Cheney	Dean of Students, Springfield College
Thomas A. Emmet	Dean of Men, University of Detroit
Howard H. Hoogesteger ...	Dean of Students, Lake Forest College
Philip Price	Director of Student Activities, New York University
Fred H. Turner, Historian	Dean of Students, University of Illinois
Arno Nowotny, Placement Officer	Dean of Student Life, University of Texas

NOTE: The material in this book is a transcribed account of the proceedings of the annual meeting. The contents are reproduced as they were transcribed without the benefit of editing or rewriting.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

This is a brief statement concerning NASPA. It was prepared by our historian, Dean Fred H. Turner, for publication in the Personnel and Guidance Journal.

Name of Association: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Address: Secretary-Treasurer, Dean Carl W. Knox, 157 Administration Building, Urbana, Illinois.

Purpose of the Association: The purpose of the Association is to discuss and study the most effective methods of aiding students in their intellectual, social, moral, and personal development.

"The institutions which are the constituent members of the Association are represented by those who are primarily concerned with the administration of student personnel programs in colleges and universities of the United States. Recognizing that many specialized abilities contribute to meeting student needs, this Association seeks to provide and stimulate leadership for the effective combination and utilization of all of these resources."

"As the student personnel program is affected by and affects the entire educational endeavor, this Association cooperates with those agencies and associations which represent higher education, government, community resources, and specialized interests in student personnel work." (Article II of the Constitution)

Brief History of the Association: The Association was founded in 1919 by Dean Thomas Arkle Clark, University of Illinois, and Dean Scott H. Goodnight, University of Wisconsin. The first meeting was held at the University of Wisconsin in 1919, and the second at Illinois in 1920. The original organization adopted the name, The National Association of Deans and Advisers of Men, and this title was continued until the 33rd Anniversary Conference at St. Louis, Missouri, in 1951 when the title was changed to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

From the start the Association adopted the policy of institutional rather than individual memberships and this was formalized in a constitution adopted in 1932.

The association has a long record of cooperative activities with other associations and had taken the lead in some inter-association activities. It has repeatedly surveyed itself on functions -- in 1925, 1928, 1939, 1940, and 1944. Since 1935 the Association has operated a Placement Service available to member institutions.

The publications of the Association have been the Annual Proceedings which are verbatim reports of all conferences since 1919 and a monthly News Letter from the Secretary to all member institutions. Through the years there have been special publications of bibliographies, special papers, reports of studies and casebook material drawn from the Harvard Seminars.

The work of the Association is done by the Annual Conference and Executive Committee and various committees and commissions. In 1962 active commissions are devoted to professional relationships, professional and legal principles and problems, development and training of student personnel administrators, program and practices, relations with the behavioral sciences and religious activities. There are numerous ad hoc and permanent committees devoted to special areas of interest. Since 1925 the Association has worked in cooperation with practically every recognized association of higher education, and in 1938 called the initial meeting with eight other groups seeking to coordinate and improve interassociation relationships. An outstanding activity began in 1954 when the Commission on Development and Training in cooperation with the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, and with Foundation support, conducted national and regional studies at the Business School and regionally with the Business School faculty in 1954, 1955, 1956, and 1957.

Membership: Memberships in the Association are institutional with the official representative designated by the institution. Four year degree granting educational institutions approved by their regional accrediting bodies are eligible for membership. There are 376 member institutions in 1962, representing institutions in fifty states, Puerto Rico, and Canada.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>P a g e</u>
Officers and Executive Committee	1
Statement of Principles	11

ORIENTATION SESSION

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Welcome and Opening Remarks -	
President Clevenger	1
Remarks Regarding Committees -	
Vice President Yanitelli	4
Remarks Regarding Commissions -	
Vice President Gwin	5
History of NASPA -	
Historian Fred H. Turner	9
Explanation of Placement Function of	
NASPA - Placement Officer Arno	
Nowotny	19

FIRST GENERAL SESSION

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

Invocation - Chaplain Ralph G. Dunlop ...	24
Introduction of Speaker -	
President-Designate McLeod	25
Welcome - Vice President Payson S. Wild..	25
Introduction of Officers by President	
Clevenger	28
Introduction of Chairmen of Commissions	
by Vice President Gwin	30
Introduction of Chairmen of Committees	
by Vice President Yanitelli	31
Introduction of Guests by Dean	
Winbigler, Commission I Chairman	33
Announcements	37

TUESDAY EVENING SESSION

June 25, 1963

Introduction of Speaker -	
Vice President Yanitelli	40
Address - "A New Era for the Student	
Personnel Administrator" -	
Dr. Samuel B. Gould	41

SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Introduction of the President of NASPA	
by President-Designate McLeod	56
President's Address - J. C. Clevenger ..	56
Announcements	75

TABLE OF CONTENTS

P a g e

FIRST BUSINESS SESSION Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Appointment of Dean DuShane as Conference Parliamentarian	76
Report of Secretary-Treasurer Knox	77
Committee Reports -	
Ad Hoc Committee on Name of the Association	79
Ad Hoc Committee on Publications	82
Commission Reports -	
Remarks regarding Commissions by Vice President in charge of Commissions, John P. Gwin	85
Commission VIII	88
Commission III	93

THIRD GENERAL SESSION Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Introduction of Speaker by Vice President Gwin	98
Address - "Students and Student Personnel Administration Behind the Iron Curtain" - Dr. R. Barry Farrell	99

FOURTH GENERAL SESSION Wednesday, June 26, 1963

Introduction of Speaker by Vice President-Designate Nygreen	113
Address - "Some Large Problems Facing Education" - Dr. Sterling McMurrin ...	113

SECOND BUSINESS SESSION Thursday, June 27, 1963

Commission and Committee Reports -	
Executive Committee Subcommittee on Budget	136
Committee on Nominations and Place ...	146
Remarks - President-Designate Yanitelli ..	148
Announcements Regarding Seminar Sessions..	149

THURSDAY MORNING SEMINAR III June 27, 1963

Introduction of Panelists	150
Address - Dr. L. A. Kirkendall "The Changing Sex Mores of Adolescents and Young Adults"	151
Discussion	166

TABLE OF CONTENTS

P a g e

FIFTH GENERAL SESSION Thursday, June 27, 1963

Introduction of Speaker by Dean R. William Cheney	186
Address - "Pabulum, Professors, and the Catalyst of Change" - Dr. Glenn A. Olds	187
Announcement Regarding ACUHO Meeting	197

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SEMINAR VI June 27, 1963

Introduction of Panelists	198
Remarks Regarding "College Placement Services" - Dr. Chester E. Peters	199
Dr. Felician F. Foltman	207
Dean Alfred R. Wolff	220
Dean Claude J. Burtenshaw	224
Discussion	226

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SEMINAR VIII June 27, 1963

Introduction of Speaker by Vice President-Designate Mark Smith	241
Address - "Formulating National Educa- tional Policy in the Private Sector" - Director Lawrence Dennis	241
Remarks by Panelists - Dean Thomas Emmet	251
Dean Carl M. Grip	253
Dean E. G. Williamson	255
Dean H. Donald Winbigler	257
Discussion	259

CONFERENCE BANQUET Thursday, June 27, 1963

Invocation	262
Introduction of Officers and Guests	265
Introduction of Speaker by Dean Don DuShane	266
Address - The Honorable Mark Hatfield	268
Presentation of Gavel by President Clevenger to President-Designate McLeod	276
Remarks - President-Designate McLeod	276
Announcement of New Officers and Executive Committee of NASPA	277

TABLE OF CONTENTS

P a g e

THIRD BUSINESS SESSION

Friday, June 28, 1963

Reports of Committees and Commissions -	
Sub-Committee on Publications	279
Commission VI, Student Financial Aids.	280
Ad Hoc Committee on the Place of USES in College and University Place- ment Services	283
Committee on Student Housing	288
Announcements	292

SIXTH GENERAL SESSION

Friday, June 28, 1963

Introduction of Speaker by Dean Carl Grip	294
Address - "Goodman's Community of Scholars: Education Without Tears" - Director James E. McClellan, Jr.	294
Remarks of Appreciation to the Staff of Northwestern University by Conference Chairman Roberts	311
Remarks of Appreciation to President Clevenger by President-Designate McLeod	312
Benediction	312
Adjournment	313

APPENDIX A

Report of Secretary	314
Interim Treasurer's Report	319

APPENDIX B

1963 Association Officers, Committees and Commissions as shown in Program	320
NASPA Annual Conference Dates	328

APPENDIX C

Attendance 45th Conference	329
----------------------------------	-----

APPENDIX D

Roster of Members, June 15, 1963	339
--	-----

APPENDIX E

Summary of Previous Meetings	349
------------------------------------	-----

(Some papers presented at Seminar Sessions were not available at press time of these proceedings. They will be duplicated and distributed in the near future.)

ORIENTATION SESSION
Tuesday, June 25, 1963

The Orientation Session for Green Ribbon Members of the 45th Anniversary Conference of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, held at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, June 25-28, 1963, convened at two-ten o'clock, NASPA President J. C. Clevenger, Dean of Students, Washington State University, presiding.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Can I call this session to order.

I am Jack Clevenger, currently President of NASPA. On behalf of our National Association I am delighted to extend the warmest kind of welcome to you new men in the ranks of NASPA.

I attended my first NASPA session at the Broadmoor in Colorado Springs. That was in the spring of 1952. I have been fortunate enough to attend every Annual Conference since that time. It has been a great experience for me. I hold in the highest esteem the friends I have made in this organization. I am sure that you fellows will too, as you get better acquainted with the men and women who are members in this Association.

This is sort of like the beginning of a school year. I think you fellows who are deans on your own campuses know the excitement that is involved in meeting and greeting and getting acquainted with the new members in your college families, and this is a similar experience for us here in NASPA.

The program lists the official opening session as four p.m. in Cahn Auditorium, but actually this Orientation Session for you Green Ribbon people is really the opening session of the Annual Conference.

As I said, I recall the Conference eleven years ago. That was the year they had just completed changing the name of the Association from NADAM (National Association of Deans of Men) to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. This was done with considerable debate, let me assure you, because it was at this Colorado Springs meeting where they also made final approval of the full change, including the bringing of women into the organization. The decision was made, if there are women student personnel administrators, these are institutional memberships, and this was considered a threat by some.

I recall the banquet at Colorado Springs where Bill Tate, the grand old Dean of Men at Georgia, was toastmaster. Bill is one of the great toastmasters in the business. I recall that Bill got up and addressed the assemblage

as "Dear Members of NASPA and NASMA." (Laughter) He wasn't exactly bitter, but you get the story. (Laughter)

I look back on my eleven years in the Association and it is a most rewarding experience for me. It is my fond hope that it will be for all of you in the years to come.

I put down some notes here -- excuse me for them -- on what I hoped for when I came to NASPA eleven years ago, and what has been justification for continued participation, and I summarized these in the following six reasons which I would like to review for you.

First of all, basically all of us hope that through our attendance at conferences such as this, listening to speakers, participating in discussions, taking part in the hotel room and residence hall and corridor "How we do it" sessions, it will be possible for all of us to develop new insights, new understandings, new techniques, methods and procedures that will help us to be more effective in our responsibilities back on the campus. I think I speak for all of us in this.

I think it is pretty obvious that each one of us would like to be an expert in his own special calling in higher education. I think it is quite reasonable to attend a meeting such as this with the expectations that our participation will contribute to a more effective functioning in our individual responsibilities back on the campus.

I tried to apply this yardstick to my own participation in NASPA, and I think this organization has made a rich contribution to my better understanding of my work. Incidentally I have picked up a great many valuable ideas from my colleagues, which I have gone back and attempted to adapt to my own institution. I trust all of you will share these same kind of experiences and feelings.

Secondly, I think that we attend a meeting such as this with the hope that we can find professional stimulation and inspiration, and a revival or a strengthening of our faith in what we are doing. The privilege of listening to men of the caliber of President Nabrit, Dr. Kieth-Lucas, Fred Weaver, the late Bob Strozier, and many of our colleagues has helped in a very important way to redirect and to strengthen our convictions.

Thirdly, I think another important reason for participation in professional groups is the hope that we can further develop and strengthen (undergird) an expression of philosophy of education which strongly supports the educational role of student personnel services, clarifies its purposes, that is a vital and integral part of the total goals of higher education.

Fourth, I think there is the desire that by virtue

of our knowledge and experience we, as individuals, can make a contribution to the increased effectiveness of our colleagues to the profession, and thus, of course, to higher education.

For most of us, I think I would characterize most of the deans I know as being really great humanitarians. Therefore, I think that we would like to give as well as to receive. I think this is an important part of the motivation of every educator, and I think it certainly characterizes the spirit of service of so many of the men I have come to know in this Association.

Fifth, I think there is the hope that our Association will have the recognition, prestige, status, if there is need to have a strong voice to command respect in the councils where vital decisions are made regarding higher education, including the decision making on federal legislation affecting higher education.

Sixth, and finally, I think that all of us welcome the opportunity to meet old friends, renew acquaintances, and make new friends through our professional association. Because we meet in a common bond of fellowship with those involved in a similar undertaking, I think we develop many lasting and important friendships among our colleagues all over this great nation.

As I mentioned earlier, I know of no group of men anywhere that I hold in higher esteem than I do my colleagues in student personnel work. They are fine men, I think basically because they are motivated by strong humanitarian interests as educators, and thus are the kind of men who find the challenges and the true rewards in our kind of work.

If what I have had to say on these six points has any value, I hope that it is for these reasons that we justify our presence here and we justify our efforts in this organization. I propose to you that as time goes on you place a yardstick beside these six goals that I have mentioned and see how well this organization measures up to these hopes and aspirations that we have for you and that we have had for NASPA.

I repeat, for all of us who have been in this Association, we are really delighted to welcome all of you into the ranks of NASPA. We hope for each of you rewarding and wonderful experiences in all that is ahead.

This is an interesting organization. In addition to the president and the executive committee, we have two vice presidents. One vice president is in charge of Commissions, one vice president is in charge of Committees. You will discover that the Commissions and Committees

are really the heart of the Association. This is where the real work gets done. This is where you men, as time goes on, will have an opportunity, in your turn and in your time, to make a contribution to the ongoing program of the Association.

We have asked Vice President Vic Yanitelli -- Vic was Vice President of Student Services of Fordham up until last Thursday. If you do not listen rather carefully you will wonder about Vic's calling in his new assignment. Vic is going to St. Peter's (laughter) as a Director of Student Personnel at the St. Peter's college in New Jersey. Our Vice President Vic, will you say something about our committees, please.

VICE PRESIDENT VICTOR R. YANITELLI, S.J. (Vice President of Student Personnel, Fordham University): Thank you, Jack. Well, I just want to support everything the President said, or I'll get fired. (Laughter)

One of the best experiences for us Jesuits as clerics has been in this Association where we have learned really what it means to be professional, and we cannot say too much about the resources, the inspiration, the professional esteem for quality that we have picked up just from being able to talk to the more experienced deans and the new ones who have the same problems we have.

On committees, we have six continuing committees-- we call them "continuing committees." I hope you understand this is a very loose use of the language.

Committee on Consulting Services -- the purpose of this committee is to set up all the possible avenues of advice and counsel that NASPA can give to an institution. A brochure was put out two years ago by this committee listing about 42 different areas where we had somebody who was a fairly qualified expert who could render some pretty solid advice. That committee is chaired by Fred Turner, the Dean of Deans from the University of Illinois and NASPA's Historian.

Committee on Cooperation with National Student Organizations -- Bill Toombs from Drexel Institute in Philadelphia has taken over, from John Gillis of Illinois State Normal University, as Chairman. There, of course, their idea is to get as close a rapport with these students as possible, and to list and to know what their organizations are and what they propose to do. This is particularly interesting, I think, in the light of Rudolph Frederick's recent history on the American College and University, where the notion you offer clearly stands out that it is the student in life outside the classroom who has radically redefined and changed the curriculum, the whole process inside the classroom and even the library. So we figure that is a pretty important committee.

Committee on Fraternity Relations -- this was chaired by Ben David of the University of Miami. He had an operation -- these things happen -- and it was ably taken over by Roland Patzer of the University of Vermont.

The Committee on Cooperation with Foreign Student Organizations has been changed to Committee on International Student Programs. A new Chairman appointed by the President and the Executive Committee is Don Anderson of the University of Washington. This whole business of foreign students has taken so many new turns in the last four or five years that we figured that cooperation with foreign student organizations did not precisely keep pace with what was happening today.

Committee on Membership -- We have a lot of problems here on policies and things to be decided. Jim Allen of Texas Tech in Lubbock is the Chairman.

In addition to these six committees, we have two people, or two functions of liaison of NASPA with the Association of College and University Housing Officers acronymically known as ACUHO. Art Kiendl from the University of Colorado, was running that, but Art has suddenly turned out to be the headmaster of a high school at Mt. Herman, so we are going to have to fill his place. Bob Goodridge of the University of Redlands has been keeping NASPA more or less in contact with the American Institute of Architects.

If there are any questions, I will be glad to answer them, but that is just a basic run-down on what these committees are and the functions they are trying to perform for NASPA and its membership.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Thank you, Vic.

Vice President in charge of Commission is John Gwin, Dean of Students at Beloit College. He has been with the Association for some time.

Incidentally, we review these Committees and Commissions for you at this time so that if you have any particular interest in possibly serving as a member some day on these Committees or Commissions that you will know who to contact. Keep in mind that the Committee and Commission meetings are open meetings during this conference. They will be listed and if you find a meeting of a Commission or Committee that strikes your particular interest, wander in, sit down, and show some interest in it. This is the way we start you to work.

John, would you review the Commissions for us, please, sir.

VICE PRESIDENT JOHN P. GWIN (Dean of Students,

Beloit College): Thank you. I might say, in thinking about Jack's comments of 1952 when we moved from NADAM to NASPA, I had no qualms about this whatsoever. I was sure that it would help us, and I can see that as a result today, Jack, we have three spots of loveliness in our meeting here in this sea of distinguished faces, so we are happy to have you with us, I want you to know that, I voted for that change. (Laughter)

The Commissions, just as Vic has pointed out, are working bodies to carry on the work of the Association throughout the year, and I will go over those briefly for you, trying to indicate somewhat what they do.

Commission I, Professional Relations, chaired by Don Winbigler, was formerly chaired by our present President Jack. He has moved up, of course, so you can see that these Commission assignments are rather important. In this Commission we attempt to maintain relationships with the other associations in higher education, whose functions and areas of interest tend to touch on the area of student personnel. One of the things that was done by the Commission in an attempt to gain understanding between the associations was the publication of the yearbook, which most of you probably have received, which describes the functions, the purposes, the officers, objectives of the various organizations which have something to do with student personnel work. If you have not received these, I am sure that you might wish to get one and you can do so by writing to Don Winbigler.

Probably one of the most important things that Commission I has done -- as some of you know, there has been a great deal of discussion about the possibilities of cooperative efforts between these various associations. Commission I, under Jack's leadership, was particularly helpful in establishing what we now call the IACC (the Inter-Association Coordinating Committee), which is made up and has representatives from the following associations: ACPA, American Association of Collegiate Registrars, Admissions Officers, Association of College Unions, Association of College and University Housing Officers, the Deans of Women, the National Association of Foreign Student Advisers, and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

This Commission also is presently making a study of the various regional Deans' associations and attempting to distinguish what, if any, connection there is with NASPA, with the idea possibly of coordinating their efforts a little further.

Commission II, Professional and Legal Principles and Problems, has to do with establishing a code of professional ethics for those of us who are working in student personnel. These were formulated, I think, and published in 1960, and stand presently as they were voted then. These

are revised occasionally. The second area of interest is one which I know is of importance to all of you, namely the area of legal implications for deans. The Commission attempts to study the implications for deans in their workings and their relationships with students, and the relationship of the institution to the student. So this is an important Commission and an interesting one. I happen to be chairing that on an interim basis at the moment because of the fact that the former Chairman had to leave.

Commission III, Development and Training of Student Personnel Administrators, is one of our really hard-working Commissions, as I am sure all of you are aware. I think many of you here are taking part in the pre-conference workshop. This was the first of these that we have had since our sessions at Harvard, and other sessions which were held in various regions. I think the members of the Commission deserve a real vote of confidence and appreciation for having carried through on this. From what we have heard from those of you who are attending, I think that it is very helpful.

Also, that Commission published the career booklet on student personnel work which has been disseminated throughout the country. I believe they printed 10,000 of these, and I think they presently are depleted. I am not positive about that, but if you want more, I would suggest that you get in touch with Bob Shaffer, who is the Chairman of that Commission.

This Commission also is active in an area which I mentioned before of concern to us, of trying to establish some coordination between associations. Particularly in working with the training of administrators, Tom Emmet has been active with IACC in trying to work out training programs in cooperation with the other associations.

They are also, as is true of Commission VI, interested in federal legislation. They are attempting to see what they can do about stepping up the inclusion of college administrators and the provisions made for guidance and counseling training on their various workshops. This, I believe, is one of the areas in which they are now actively working.

Commission IV, Programs and Practices Evaluation, is a Commission which is presently in flux. We are trying to re-evaluate the working of this Commission because there seems to be some overlapping with others, and it is possible that this may be continued, or it may be dropped, or the functions may be changed. So at the moment Mr. McCloskey from Loyola is acting as Chairman. They are acting to study the Commission and see what we will do about that.

Commission V, Relationships with the Behavioral

Sciences, is one which was established fairly recently and a great deal of work was done by Mark Smith in attempting to work out relationships between the people who were doing research and teaching in the areas of behavioral sciences, which so directly affect our work. The results of that survey were, I think, rather startling to the Association members, but also very helpful in that they opened our eyes somewhat and made us realize that there is a need for a definite cooperation between the behavioral sciences and the Association.

Commission VI, Student Financial Aids, is chaired by Carl Grip from Temple University. This is another very active Commission and one which you, I think, are very much interested in. This too has made an attempt to cooperate with other Associations and is now a joint Commission having representatives from the Registrars, the Deans of Women, and there are several other associations represented in this joint Commission. They have had meetings in Washington, meeting with representatives of the U. S. Office of Education and have taken steps to influence legislation in an attempt to change the present status of legislation -- for instance, limiting the ceiling on loans of \$250,000, and also trying to move into the area of work-study scholarships. Carl Grip would be happy, I know, to have you sit in with the Commission, if you would like to. Some of the areas they are presently studying are the NDEA loan provisions, work scholarships, state scholarships, institutional policies, commercial loan programs, and income tax exemptions.

Commission VII, Student Attitudes and Values, was formerly listed as the Commission on Religious Activities. It has been changed, as you can see, to the Commission on Student Attitudes and Values. The old title seemed to narrow the scope sufficiently to immobilize the Commission, and we have this year changed it to Student Attitudes and Values, hoping that the broadened scope would foster interest and get them moving. This is under the Chairmanship of Joe Gluck from West Virginia.

Commission VIII, The Student and Social Issues, is a new Commission two years old. We will be hearing a report from Dean Williamson from Minnesota, who Chairs that Commission. That has to do with the activities of students, the expression of their opinions, their actions in the area of civil action, social action and, as you know, generates a great deal of emotion and furor, and so on, and is one in which all of us get very much wrapped up. We have been given a grant to proceed on this, and you will get further information on this.

If any of you wish to participate in any of these meetings, or become active on any of the Commissions, feel free to see me or the Chairman of the Commission, and we will be sure to pass your word along.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Thank you, Jack. Any questions for Jack?

DEAN HAROLD MEESE (Michigan College of Mining and Technology): Is there a list of where and when these meetings are held?

VICE PRESIDENT GWIN: Yes, it is presently on the bulletin board in Allison Hall at the registration desk, and I have some of the listings with me.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: No one knows this Association or the men in it as well as does Fred Turner, Dean of Students at the University of Illinois, our Historian. Fred is a Past President of this Association. He served as secretary-treasurer something over twenty years, prior to serving as President. Here is a man who has given more of his professional life, more hours than anyone else I know, to advancing this Association and in service to its members.

Fred, as Historian, your presentation.

DEAN FRED H. TURNER (History of NASPA; Dean of Students, University of Illinois): Thank you. Jack, Ladies and Gentlemen: I hope to make this quite informal. I would like somehow or other to bring this historical material alive for you. I would like it to mean something in terms of personalities. Perhaps one of the best ways to start it would be to point to our reporter here, Leo Isen, who has been our reporter since 1938 -- he and his brother. They represent a reporting company in Chicago who have reported our conferences and printed our proceedings since 1938. We have never had a contract with them. They have delivered for us and we think we have delivered for them, and Leo has made himself such a place in the hearts of our members that last year we named him as an honorary member of the Association. This is the kind of thing that goes on in this group. It is a very friendly and informal group and that is what I would like to get across to you all the way through in what I present.

We met on this campus twenty-nine years ago, in 1934. At that time the President of Northwestern University was Walter Dill Scott. Scott Hall, where we are meeting this afternoon, was named for Walter Dill Scott, one of the great Presidents of Northwestern University. If you get to digging around in psychological tests, you will find that Walter Dill Scott made his great reputation, along with Robert Clothier of Pittsburgh, in the development of the tests for the army in World War One. Walter Dill Scott was a great psychologist and made a tremendous reputation for himself and did some very fine work in the early testing programs for the army during the first World War.

At the time we met here in 1934, the Dean of Men was a man named James Armstrong. James Armstrong served

here for a number of years. He died only this past year down in Henderson, Kentucky. He had several young assistants at that time. One of them was a young man Willard Buntain. Willard Buntain is now Director of Housing here at Northwestern University and in charge of all the arrangements for the housing of this Conference. Another was a man -- I cannot remember his first name -- whose last name was Ott. What was his first name, Les?

ASSISTANT DEAN LES ROLLINS (Graduate School, Business Administration, Harvard University): Ed.

DEAN TURNER: Ed Ott later on went to get his doctorate in political science and went into the service, and came out as a Colonel. He was a professor and a colonel in the army, and now he is the Director of Admissions at Delaware.

The third of these young assistants was a man named Lester Rollins. Les is sitting over in the corner, and I think it might be well, Les, if you stand up and let these people see a man who, although no longer a member of this organization officially, has probably done as many things for it as anyone in the organization. Les is one of the Deans of the Harvard Graduate School of Business. He has been out of the organization for years, in an official capacity, and yet he has attended meetings regularly and has done many things for us, some of which I will talk about a little later.

These three young assistants, although their paths went in different directions, here is Les meeting with us twenty-nine years after the meeting of 1934.

With that as an introductory, I might say that at the time we met here in 1934 there was very little housing on the campus. At the convention there were less than 100 people here, wives and all, and they were housed in the Evanston YMCA, some distance down the line here, and we had our convention banquet in Austin Hall, which is one of the older halls up the line here. That was a long time ago, but I want to go even back of that.

I have some notes here, but this is largely to refer to dates. Incidentally, before we go any further, I would like to pay tribute to these men who have been here at this pre-conference seminar. This is the hardest working group of men I have ever seen. They have just about killed some of us oldtimers who are not used to working from nine o'clock in the morning until eleven o'clock in the night. When I say "from nine o'clock in the morning until eleven at night," I mean that, because that is what they are doing. They work right until lunch and start in at one o'clock, and work until six, and have dinner, and start in right away again and work until eleven o'clock. That has been going on since Sunday noon, and I am glad the thing is over, as far

as I am concerned. (Laughter) It is almost too much for me. I'm too old for activities of this kind. (Laughter)

This Association started out as the National Association of Deans and Advisers of Men. It didn't even start out as the National Association. It started out when Thomas Arkle Clark, the Dean of Men at the University of Illinois, and Scott Goodnight, who was the Dean of Men at the University of Wisconsin, corresponded -- this was in December of 1919. They carried on some correspondence. They were good friends and had been for a long time, and they said, "Let's get a little group together at Madison, or down at Illinois, and talk about mutual problems that we have with the students who are back in school after World War One."

The two men got a total of six people together, who met at Madison, Wisconsin, the last of December in 1919. Dean Clark did not get to go, after helping to set the thing up. He got the flu at the last minute and did not get to go, so Dean Goodnight carried on the meeting with Strauss from Michigan, who was Chairman of a committee over there. They had no dean at that time. There was Dean Rienow from out at Iowa State Teachers College at Cedar Rapids, and three or four others that they picked up in various places, who got together and talked about the mutual problems that they had, having to do with students coming back just after the first World War.

I think you might be interested in some of the topics they talked about, because the record is quite clear on this. They talked about discipline. (Laughter) They talked about automobiles for the students. They talked about fraternities. They talked about rooming houses. They talked about credit for military work that had been done during the first World War. They talked about student activities. I suspect they talked about some other things too.

The record shows that Dean Goodnight got his automobile tire caught in a car track in Madison and nearly turned over, and they were surprised that they ever got out of it safely, but they did.

That was the first meeting, and there were six men present. They agreed they would meet the following year, and they said at that time, in 1919, that it might be well just to call this the National Association of Deans of Men, and the next year they made it the Deans and Advisers of Men.

Nine of them met down at the University of Illinois in 1920. I remember that meeting because I was a clerk in Dean Clark's office. I did not attend the meeting, but I was a clerk in his office and I ran errands and emptied ash trays and things like that. Smoking on the campus was forbidden at that time and we had to get special permission to smoke in Dean Clark's office, and he got the permission and

I looked after the ash trays. (Laughter) That was my participation in this second meeting.

There were some very strong men in the second meeting. They were great men at the time, and they went on to become even greater men. Chances are these names are strange to you, but you can read about them, and you will find that these are good names that stand up. Clark and Goodnight were there. Goodnight was a professor of German, originally, at the University of Wisconsin. He stayed on through in that position and was a professor of German throughout. Clark was a professor of English at the University of Illinois. Dean Nicholson of the University of Minnesota was a man who attended the second meeting. I do not remember what his academic discipline was. Dean Melchoir from the University of Kentucky was one of the second group. He was a scientist. Stanley Coulter from Purdue was a very well known botanist. Robert Rienow of Iowa was a professor of English. And very soon after that a man named Floyd Field from down at Georgia Tech came into the picture. He was a professor of Mathematics. In other words, these were men who came from academic disciplines and were appointed to these positions, largely because of their personalities and ability which they had shown.

The third meeting was then held out at Iowa City, with Bob Rienow. Bob, incidentally, was one of the few bachelors that we have ever had who stayed a bachelor throughout his lifetime, and was Dean out at the University of Iowa. There were sixteen people at this third meeting at Iowa City.

The fourth meeting was held at Lexington, Kentucky with Dean Melchoir, in 1922. There were twenty people there.

The fifth meeting was held at Purdue in 1923. There were just seventeen there. They lost three in the meantime.

Then in 1924 the sixth meeting was held at the University of Michigan. That was the first meeting that I really attended. Dean Clark took me along as a young assistant. There were twenty-nine people in attendance. We sat around one big table on the second floor of the Michigan Union, which at that time was a much smaller structure than it is now. They had the main wing built, but the rest of it had not been built at all. This meeting, I think, might be noteworthy for one thing and that is the fact that the first easterner came into the picture at that time. A man named McClenahan from Princeton University came to that meeting. I remember especially because he wore a frock coat throughout the entire meeting and he spoke very seldom, but when he did it was worth hearing and he had lots to say. He was a fine speaker.

I think I might add right there that all of these

early men were tremendous people. They were men of real status. They were men of great character and great personality. I cannot remember a one of them who did not have a real good sense of humor some place along the line. There would be a twinkle and they would get off a wisecrack that would lay you in the aisle. They all had the ability to do that. I think that may have been one of the reasons they were chosen to do the work they did.

The 1926 meeting, the eighth meeting, was held in Minneapolis and it could be characterized, I suppose, as the first meeting that seemed to be actually professional in character, because the people who were running that meeting invited the start of the American Psychological Association to meet with them and they held the meeting in Minneapolis. There were about fifty people in attendance. The program will show that they got into quite a number of psychological questions which were pretty well in advance of the time. George Stoddard, who is now at New York University and was one time President of University of Illinois, was from Iowa University, and he was one of the leaders at that meeting.

In 1929 they met in Washington, D. C. There was a man named Doyle, Stratton Doyle -- do you remember, Les, what this man Doyle's first name was? He was a great man in journalism and he has long since retired. Doyle was the host there and this meeting has some importance for us because there was a young fellow named Gardner from the University of Akron who appeared on the scene at that time, and he said this group ought to have a constitution of some kind, and they agreed they should. So they said, "Don, you can just write it if you think we should have one." (Laughter) "You write a constitution." So he did.

George Culver of Stanford University presided at that meeting -- he was President. Vic Moore of Texas was the secretary at that time. These, again, are names that are much loved among the older members of the Association. George Culver was a psychologist, and he was a man who really brought the full question of the psychological abilities and aptitudes into our Association, and he had an interest in psychiatry which he introduced into some of the programs.

Vic Moore of the University of Texas was one of the much loved men throughout the years, and later he was President of the Association and did a tremendous job for us. "Shorty" started to work as assistant with Vic Moore at the University of Texas.

The thirteenth meeting was held at Knoxville, Tennessee -- it is labeled as Knoxville, but actually we did not meet in Knoxville; we met over in the little town of Gatlinburg. I did not go to that one. I was completing my doctorate that year and my final examinations conflicted with the meeting, but people who attended the Gatlinburg

meeting often said that was the best meeting they ever had. They had the best time down there and had the finest experiences.

I mentioned the fact that this man Gardner had proposed a constitution for the group, and it was formalized and adopted in 1932. From 1932 to 1937 this man Gardner was the secretary of the Association and later he served two terms as president. He was a very able man, and in fact he is still over at the University of Akron. He just has retired as Provost, and this year much to his surprise because they held it a secret right up until the time it happened, his own institution gave him an honorary degree. I think an honorary degree from your own institution is one that is well to be remembered.

The organization by that time was well established and beginning to be known pretty well. As I mentioned, the 1934 meeting was held here at Northwestern. Two things might be added to the Northwestern comments though, and they are these: Les and his boys worked under Jim Armstrong and made the first index of the minutes of the proceedings of this Association. Up to the Northwestern meeting we had complete verbatim records of all the meetings beginning with the third one, the 1921 meeting. We had copies of the minutes of each meeting, but we lacked meetings one and two. Les and his boys had put together an index on all the topics that had been discussed, and that was made available at the Northwestern meeting.

In addition, we wrote into the minutes of the 1934 meeting the original minutes of the first and second meetings and those are published in the 1934 edition so that we now have the complete records verbatim of this Association from the time of its founding. I think it is the only professional organization that has anything of this kind. The value of that record can very well be cited by the fact that there is such a growing demand from the best libraries in the country for complete sets of these minutes. We are not able to supply complete sets, but they will write into the secretary and ask for volumes so-and-so, and as time goes on, apparently, these older volumes become more and more valuable. I think the fact that we do have a complete record of our Association is really a very valuable thing.

We had not exceeded an attendance of more than 100 until the 1938 meeting at Madison, Wisconsin. We had 164 in attendance at that meeting. That may have been bolstered just a little bit by the fact that we invited representatives from the National Independent Students Association to meet with us at that time, and they did and swelled the attendance considerably. The minutes of that meeting are worth getting out and reading today, if only for one thing, and that is the discussion that took place there between Dean Christian Gauss of Princeton University and one

of the deans at the University of Wisconsin. I have forgotten the name of the Dean at Wisconsin, but I remember the comments that Dean Gauss made. If you would like to read a discussion of the relative merits of the academic versus the personnel point of view, it is a good discussion.

Am I taking too much time, Jack?

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Go ahead.

DEAN TURNER: The 1930s -- I will not go into those meetings in detail except to say those were depression years and there were lots of problems, and we met and discussed them, as you might expect. We had people from the NYA. We had Aubrey Williams with us for three years in a row, and darned if he didn't tell the same story three years in a row. The third year, instead of letting him give his punch line, we gave it back to him when he tried to tell us the story. (Laughter) He took that all right. (Laughter)

The 1940s, of course, were the war years and we had our troubles in even having meetings. We missed the 1945 meeting because the Office of Defense Transportation had banned all conventions, and we did not have it. But we met most of the time. The Association, through the secretary, got out during the war years what started out as a little bulletin on enlistment opportunities for young men. There were so many questions being raised about what could they get into and be best fitted for, we started out with a little one page bulletin for our own members about war opportunities which grew to the place that we were publishing it for our own membership and mailing out about 1200 of them. Soon after that the American Council on Education took it over and did it on a national basis, so that was one thing we started which was picked up and carried on.

The rest of the 1940s, of course, had all the problems of the post war years, and I will not go into detail on that.

The 1951 meeting in St. Louis has already been mentioned. This was an important meeting because that was the year when we changed our name from the National Association of Deans and Advisers of Men to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. This was the first meeting where we went over 200, because we got up to 222 people present at that one. That is when the name was changed and it was agreed women could belong to the Association, although that was done with great heartache on the part of some people because they felt this should stay as a men's organization. It was an important meeting in a lot of respects because Vic Spathelf, the Dean at Wayne University and now the President of Ferris Institute in Michigan, came forth with the first suggestions -- and I think Les Rollins had a good deal to do with this too -- regarding the organization of the Commissions to do certain things.

We also mentioned the Broadmoor meeting the next year in Colorado Springs in 1952, at which time the Commissions were perfected and Les, at that time, proposed the Harvard seminars for the study of higher education through the case method. Of course, with his help and the help that he got for us from the Foundations, we went on to accomplish that. This was a very important meeting and one that should be marked down in our books.

I remember one thing -- again to get into personalities on these reminiscences. After the St. Louis meeting was over Blair Knapp, who is now the President of Denison University, had been the President of NADAM, and then NASPA (had been the President at that meeting), and he was one of the men who did not want to change the name. He was very unhappy about it. Dan Feder -- I do not remember where he was from at that time, Denver or where -- wanted to especially change it. After the meeting was over I happened to have in my room the remains of a bottle of Scotch and Blair knew it was there. He said, "Let's go up and look at that bottle of Scotch for a little bit." About that time Dan knocked on the door and came in. Dan and Blair were talking about this change of name and Dan said, "Well, Blair, I don't see why you're so unhappy about changing this name."

Blair said, "Well, I'll tell you something, Dan. One of these days I'm going to organize a reunion of the members of NADAM, and when we do that I'm going to go to their reunion and you are not going to go because you never did belong." This was Dan's first year in NASPA. And Blair said, "You can't come because you didn't belong to NADAM, but I did and I can go to it." (Laughter) That was how Blair felt about it. But the name was changed anyway, and the activities went on from there.

The fortieth meeting was the first one that went over 300. That went to 306. That was held in French Lick, Indiana, at the hotel there. That was the first meeting that women attended. We had a Dean of Students from the Richmond, Virginia, Professional Schools there by the name of Johnson, who since died. She was a good one too. She was a very, very able woman and she held her own in company down there, and that was a rough thing to do.

At the forty-fourth meeting in Philadelphia we went over 400. There were 408 people attending the meeting there.

Now just a few things about policies, from a historical standpoint.

Although we have debated a lot about it, we have always held for the institutional membership. Any institution that is fully accredited as a four year degree granting institution, fully accredited and recognized by its degree granting association, by its proper association, may become

a member, and we have held to that, although there has been a lot of talk about changing. The reason for that is somewhat obvious. It means that those institutional members may bring just as many people as they want to to the meetings and have them feel that they are a part of it.

We have been involved in cooperative activities, that were mentioned earlier in one of the discussions, in the Commissions. The first cooperative action between the Associations was at a meeting we called in Cleveland in 1938. I served as secretary of that meeting. Scott Goodnight chaired it. Don Gardner did most of the work on it, and there were eight different Associations called together. We had a three day session over in the Statler Hotel in Cleveland, and we accomplished a lot of good and had something started that looked like it was going to amount to something, but of course the war difficulties came on soon after that and the result was that the work pretty well fell by the wayside until after the war was over.

I remember we had Hal Cowley come and talk to us at the meeting, and he gave an excellent resumé of what would be needed to get more cooperation between the different associations. In fact, he talked far ahead of his time, as far as what has happened since, and many of the things he talked about then have come to pass.

We have never had any inhibitions at all about examining ourselves. In 1925, 1928, 1939, 1940 and 1944 we conducted internal surveys of our own members to see what they were doing, what they should be doing, their preparation, and backgrounds, things they would like to do that they were not doing, and so on. The records are all in the printed proceedings on that, although some of those copies are pretty hard to get hold of, unless you happen to have a copy of it.

The Placement Service has been operated since 1935. This man Gardner again picked that up and started it when he was the secretary, and he did a good job on it.

Regarding publications, we have had our proceedings all through the years. We have had a Newsletter, off and on, but most of the time on. We have had a newspaper all the time since about 1935, sometimes monthly and sometimes quarterly, depending on the needs. We published a lot of pamphlets, and a couple of bibliographies. They are somewhat out of date now, but they were published. We disseminated special bulletins all through the years, especially in emergency times when it seemed to be helpful.

With this development of Commissions in 1954, I suppose actually that our Association made more history, thanks to Les and the grants that he received from the Carnegie Foundation and the Ford Foundation for these seminars which were held in 1954, 1955, 1956 and 1957 at Harvard

and then around the country on a regional basis. I attended the first one. I think possibly the most inspiring experience that I have had in my mature life is the attendance at that first Harvard seminar. We all got a lot out of it, and it is just as much fun to come back and participate in this seminar we had here over these two days as it was in the original forum in 1954.

I think I had better get this wound up, Jack. I have been taking too much time.

I might say to you that you will get out of the report of this meeting here the information that we now have 396 institutional members. Before the Executive Committee gets through meeting it will be over 400 I am sure, because they have some applications on the docket for approval here.

The big dilemma we have faced all through the years and we are still facing, and I do not think there is any way of solving it, is how to act small while growing big. That is the thing that has worried us all through the years. Harold Lobdell, who was President at the time we met here at Northwestern in 1934, who was the dean at Massachusetts Institute of Technology -- incidentally, his death occurred not too long ago. His death occurred in Lubbock, Texas, this spring. Lobdell was a kind of a rebel anyway, and he held we should pick the 100 schools we wanted in the Association and take them in and quit, and that would be it. We would not take anyone else in unless someone quit, or the institution failed or something of that kind. He was never able to sell that. But we have worried about this whole problem of how to maintain the fellowship of the earlier years, which has meant so much to so many of us, and at the same time make what we think are the advantages of the Association available to the people all around the country and in different kinds of institutions.

We have a lot of different problems. Junior colleges are breaking out all over the country, as you know, and branch institutions are coming into existence. We have talked a great deal about how we are going to take care of them. We ought to do something to get the excellent Junior Colleges, yet there seems to be no practical way of doing it without making this into such a big meeting that we will lose the fellowship that we value so highly.

We have talked about associate members of some kind. More and more women will be coming in, and that is desirable and we have to face that, and we have to have it. I do not know how we will solve these things. The Executive Committee is working very hard trying to find solutions to them.

I think if I wind this up with any one thought it is this: That this is a friendly organization and we have

tried to keep it that way, and I think it is the friendships that have really held it together. As soon as you have been in just a little while, you will quickly discover that your campus is no longer the one where your office is. Your campus is the United States and Canada, Puerto Rico, and Alaska, because you will get to know these deans -- in Hawaii too, because although the dean of Hawaii is not going to be here, he attends pretty regularly. You will find that these men will become such good friends of yours that you will do much of your business by long distance telephone with friends that you know. When you want to know something from a friend in a state far away, you will get on the telephone and call your friend whom you met in this group. How many of us do that every day in the week it is hard to say, but the longer you are in it you will find more of you will be doing it.

If there is any one thing that has characterized this group through the years, it has been not an association of professional workers, but it has been an association of very good friends. I hope we can keep it this way.

I am sure this has been rambling, but I hope that it will give you a little of the concept that people have made the organization and as long as we can keep people in the forefront in it, I am sure we will do all right. Thank you very much. (Applause)

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Thank you very much, Fred. I think you can see why our friend Fred carries so well his role as historian of this Association.

Now I turn to one of the great personalities in this Association with long years of service, former President, Chairman for the past twelve years (I think it is) of our Placement Service, one of the great, warm friends we have known down through the years in our kind of work, Dean "Shorty" Nowotny, Dean of Student Life at the University of Texas.

DEAN ARNO NOWOTNY ("Explanation of Placement Function of NASPA;" University of Texas): I am going to come up here for obvious reasons. (Laughter) You wouldn't see me if I got down there.

You know, Fred couldn't cover every year, but I do not know why Fred left out the first year that I attended, which was at Boulder, Colorado. I think it was around 1928. I got on the front page of the Denver Post. I will tell you how I got there. They took a picture of me in a straw hat. This was in May, and in Texas you wear straw hats in May. A guy threw a snowball at my straw hat, by the way. I had my picture taken with Carl Morrow, the Dean of Men at Washington State, and he weighed 300 pounds, and I weighed about 90 pounds soaking wet, and we got on the front page of the Denver Post. That ought to be recorded in the minutes, Fred. (Laughter)

After all these introductions -- I know you people have been in lots of meetings before and you are getting tired -- this is going to be very short.

You know, I think Fred has hit the nail on the head in that this meeting is set up to try to convince the new people who are here for their first national meeting that we have an awareness of the great importance of the individual in the "bigness" whether it is a big school, or a big fraternity, or a big association. We want you as individuals to feel important and feel that you are wanted, to be known to all of us.

I will never forget as long as I live the first year I got to see this guy Vic Moore. Man, I had a lot of problems, and who did I write to? Scott Goodnight. He did not dare dictate the answers. He wrote them on his own typewriter and pecked them out himself. Those are the kind of friends that we would like to be to our fellow members of this Association, people you can trust, who will answer your questions frankly and honestly and immediately, no matter where you are and where you come from.

At the University of Texas a colleague tells the story that when they talk about the deans and administration the faculty refer to us as "they." The students refer to us as "it." I don't know what they call you at your school. (Laughter) You have met a lot of the brass here today. Someone said the upper crust is just a bunch of crumbs held together by dough. (Laughter) I do not know what we are here today but anyhow, we are here.

I hope every man and woman who is here who wears a green ribbon will honestly believe that Fred Turner and Jack Clevenger and these other men believe every word they said. We feel flattered when young men ask us questions because even if we don't know the answer, we will think up some answer and we will try to tell you the truth about what the answer might be.

About this placement business, it is something that we do by ear. We will be in a meeting in a room right below us, Room 220, all day Wednesday and all day Thursday. We have the bulletins, a list of openings, just a little two sentence description of openings that are available, and a lot of these men are here looking for employees, assistant deans, deans of all kinds. Then we have a list of people who have M.A. degrees, who are looking and are available. Here are people with Ph.D. degrees, and people with B.A. degrees. These people with B.A. degrees, of course, would be smart to take some of these housing jobs where they can get room and board and a little stipend. And these green sheets are new jobs. There have been four or five new jobs that came in by mail. Then if you never registered, and you are looking for a job, this is it.

So these are the simple things we do at the convention. There will be six people on this committee, and there will be at least two of us present at all times, all day Wednesday and all day Thursday. If you are interested in looking over this group, or if you are looking for a colleague to add to your staff, we will do our best to introduce you to some people who are here who are looking for associate deans, assistant deans, directors of employment, directors of financial aids, and what have you.

The Association prides itself on the fact that when you register down there, when you come down there, there is no cost -- although they voted the other day that that would not be so after this time. So this is your last chance to get a free ride. After this year, they will charge a little money for those people who want this service, the applicant. So if you are interested, come down to see us.

There is one thing. There is a Committee on Nominations that nominates a President-Designate and two Vice Presidents-Designate. If you have any suggestions, Fred Turner is on that committee, and please make suggestions as to who you think you would like to see become the leader of this group the year after next.

We have already voted for five years to go to Detroit next April; April, 1965 we go to Washington, D. C.; and Seattle in 1966; Lubbock in 1967; and 1968, Urbana. Fred, I don't know whether or not you knew it, but that is the fiftieth anniversary of NASPA and NADAM, and that thing is going to be given in honor of Fred Turner, and that is the year he retires. What a wonderful time we will have recognizing and showing our respect and confidence to one of the greatest guys I have ever known, who is always modestly in the background, unselfishly serving this organization, as Jack said, more than anybody else I know.

I could not sit down without saying this about a little fellow who used to be assistant dean. He and I started out together. He used to be assistant dean at Northwestern. He was known as "Whitey" Rollins. He was the president of Phi Delta Theta. He played a little football and this and that. "Whitey" Rollins was well known and he had a pretty good job, but he told this man Scott, he said, "You have done a lot for fraternities on this campus, and you have not done a thing for the independents." He said, "You want a job?" He said, "No, I have a job." He went out to work for General Motors but he was not happy. He was a crazy guy like that. He came back here, and Scott put him in charge of housing. He was responsible for having a plan of dormitories that had the personnel point of view. I do not know of any dormitories that were better run. He was interested in knowing every employee, every cook and every bottle washer and every waiter, and everybody. He said, "You are just as important as the head man."

He published a report on this and Harvard heard about it and read it and they took him and gave him a job, and he has been there ever since. He just sits in the background. He will come down and evaluate my staff, criticize them and meet with them, and then he said, "You have a good staff. They are wonderful. All they need is a little leadership." (Laughter) That is how friendly he is when he comes down. (Laughter)

To me, he is my severest critic and yet one of the grandest men, and that is why this Association, I think, is great. Why does he come back here? He is a big shot at Harvard. He is in the Graduate School of Business, but he comes back and helps us put it over.

So there is an old short guy from Texas who will feel very flattered if you will ask him some questions about placement. I do not know many answers, but I will try to think up some answers if you have any questions that bother you. That is about all, Jack. (Applause)

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thank you, "Shorty." Thank you very much, "Shorty," Fred, Jack and Vic.

While you are on stories -- you know, he comes out to Washington, borrows the state car, borrows my secretary, tells the president how to run the institution. This guy really gets around. How about it, Les?

We are really flattered when you new men come up to us and put out your hand, give us your name, tell us where you are from. It is really a flattering experience. We will try to do the same. We hope to get acquainted with all of you as rapidly as we can. Our earnest hope for each of you is long years of happy experiences with this Association and with the people in it.

You have already learned, long ago, that you get out of anything in direct ratio to the efforts you yourself expend into it. We encourage your active participation, your concerns, but most of all we welcome your friendship and the opportunity to get to know you. We really look forward to this.

The opening session is scheduled at four o'clock in the Cahn Auditorium. Are there any questions from you men?

DEAN CHARLES H. RICHMOND (Oklahoma Central State College): Let me ask one question about the reception and so forth which will take place later. Since this is a June meeting (which I believe happens every fourth year) where some of us brought our wives, which of these sessions should our wives attend, may they attend, etc.?

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Meal service in these

dormitories starts with the evening meal this evening. The tag that you have and the one that you have for your wife buys the meals and so forth. The reception which is at five o'clock, we hope very much you will bring your wife. That is one of the things we look forward to. We will have a short receiving line. We will have some non-alcoholic refreshments, since this is a good Methodist institution, and we will look forward to meeting you and your wives at that reception.

Your wives are welcome to attend any of the sessions. They are most welcome to come in and sit with us. You will hear more about the program when we meet at four o'clock, from Chairman O. D. Roberts. There is a very -- well, let us say it is not an ambitious program for the wives, but we thought they would like to do some visiting and shopping while they are here, so we have not over-organized the wives. You will hear more about that at the four o'clock meeting.

DEAN RICHMOND: The four o'clock meeting would be helpful for them also?

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Yes, it would be.

VICE PRESIDENT GWIN: Jack, you might tell them about the 8:30 meeting for the wives.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: I do not know all the details on this, do you, John?

VICE PRESIDENT GWIN: It is my understanding that at 8:30 tomorrow morning there is a reception, or a brunch, or an early breakfast or something at 8:30 at Mrs. McLeod's home.

VICE PRESIDENT YANITELLI: At 8:30 a continental breakfast at Dean McLeod's house. Mrs. McLeod is the hostess and the address is 1620 Judson Avenue. It is just down the street a little bit, in Evanston. They are going to leave the McLeod home at 9:30 for a bus tour of the North Shore and a visit to the famed Old Orchard shopping center, Marshall Field, and it advises here that you do not let her have any money when she goes out. (Laughter)

... Conference announcements ...

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Any other questions? See you all at the next session.

... The Orientation Session recessed at three-twenty-five o'clock ...

FIRST GENERAL SESSION

Tuesday, June 25, 1963

The Conference reconvened at four-ten o'clock, President J. C. Clevenger, Dean of Students, Washington State University, presiding.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: On behalf of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, I am privileged to greet you and to declare officially open the 45th Annual Conference of this Association.

I now call upon the Chaplain Ralph Dunlop, Chaplain of Northwestern University, for our invocation. Chaplain Dunlop.

CHAPLAIN RALPH G. DUNLOP (Northwestern University):
Let us pray.

Almighty and most gracious God, we express to Thee our gratitude for these occasions which bring us together in a common work, from diverse places and situations. For the renewal of friendships and the encouragement of our colleagues, and the challenge of deliberations and of comradeship in our work, we give thanks.

May this Conference and this Association be a means of inspiration and encouragement to every one of us associated with student life on our campuses. May our problems and our work, however vexing or intriguing or baffling they may be, not become to us tribulation too great to bear or frustrating beyond endurance. For, instead, we trust that perspective, refreshment of our minds and hearts, and new resolve may undergird and nourish us by these deliberations and through our common task.

Bless this Association in its every endeavor. May its work continue to be done with integrity and with invested understanding of and sensitivity to the students who come under our care. May it be bold to take courageous action on behalf of student life and in the work of higher education, both in our hemisphere and in our wider world.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord, we pray. Amen.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: I now call upon our host Dean, Jim McLeod, to introduce Vice President Wild of Northwestern, one of our hosts here this afternoon.

Before I ask Jim to come up here, Jim and Vice President Wild, and all of your colleagues here at this fine University, we want to express to you our deep gratitude as an Association for permitting us to meet here on this very lovely campus.

I listened to the presentation of our Historian, Dean Fred Turner of Illinois, at our Green Ribbon Meeting this afternoon, and Dean Fred told us there that this is the second time this Association has met on this campus. Fred, if I listened as I should have, I believe the first meeting here was when we were known as NADAM, the National Association of Deans and Advisers of Men, and we met here in 1929.

DEAN TURNER: Thirty-four.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thirty-four, was it? So this is the second time we have met here, and we are delighted to have the chance of enjoying this wonderful campus for our sessions.

Jim.

PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE McLEOD: Jack, Members of NASPA: It is my privilege at this time to present to you a colleague, and, incidentally, my boss. Payson S. Wild came to Northwestern twelve years ago, after a varied and interesting career in higher education up to that point, and which has been more varied and interesting since then. A native Chicagoan, a graduate of the University of Wisconsin, he received his master's and doctorate at Harvard University. He was a Professor of Political Science at that esteemed institution, and then Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, from which position he came to Northwestern, as Vice President and Dean of Faculties.

I am delighted to present to you at this time Payson S. Wild, Vice President of Northwestern University, and Dean of Faculties. (Applause)

VICE PRESIDENT PAYSON S. WILD (Vice President and Dean of Faculties, Northwestern University): Thanks very much, Jim.

Dean Clevenger, I can say that Northwestern is extremely happy to have you here, and I hope you feel welcome. Therefore, I trust that the remarks of welcome on my part are really unnecessary and superfluous, because I trust that the arrangements and all of the plans for the programs are satisfactory to you, and I hope you have an extremely successful meeting.

It so happens that the President, President Miller, is on his way to Europe to attend, as one of about a dozen American University Presidents, a meeting of British Commonwealth University Presidents and Chancellors. He asked me before he left, knowing this meeting was coming here, to express to you his own greetings, and so I do.

I can assure you that we are aware of the importance of your jobs. Though I am not directly concerned, I know something about the problems you face through my association with Jim McLeod, and also as the father of three children, the last of whom is teen-aged -- I have survived the other two, who are now in their 20's -- I am aware of the kinds of problems which are becoming increasingly acute these days.

Not so long ago we heard something about the Four Freedoms, but it seems to me a good many young people these days are interested in innumerable freedoms, way beyond any four, and they come to you, really, with more interest in license than in a sense of restrained freedom.

From time to time, especially in recent years, I have been appalled at the tensions and at the apparent breakdowns of old customs which exist in our high schools, and,

when these people come to college and come under your guidance, I wonder sometimes how you can possibly survive, because you are dealing not only with young people, you are dealing with their parents too, as you well know. And that quadruples or quintuples the problem, as far as I can see. Therefore, the sorts of tasks you are engaged in seem to me of unusual significance in times like these.

You are not helped, also, I am aware, by the fact that there are not so many Mr. Chips left on the faculty. So many of the faculty people these days are consultants for business. They are in Liberia, they are in Washington, they are on committees, they are in charge of enormous research projects. The amount of time they give to students, unfortunately, is becoming too limited. It is one of the paradoxes of teacher training these days that men who spend their years to obtain a Ph.D. and supposedly become a teacher have an eventual idea of having no students and wish to work only in a laboratory or library, not wishing to be bothered by students.

I heard the other day of a professor in a renowned university who said "I hate undergraduates." This means you are not obtaining as much support as I think you used to from the academic side of the institution.

Here at Northwestern we endeavor to insist that our faculty members teach at the undergraduate as well as the graduate level. We do not appoint research professors as such. We think such people who are not interested in teaching should belong to a research institute and not to a university or to a college.

It is not always easy to hold the line, and sometimes we have lost very promising young men who think they are going to be eventual Nobel Prize winners, who say, "Look, I want a laboratory, I do not want any graduate students. I might have a graduate assistant, or research associate," and we have lost some such people. We still insist on teaching, and we still have people on the faculty who are concerned with Jim McLeod's problems.

As to Northwestern University itself, some of you may wonder why we are called Northwestern University, located as we are, only one-third of the way from the Atlantic seaboard. Perhaps I can remind you that this University was founded 112 years ago by nine young Methodists. They decided that Chicago was too large a city. It had 30,000 people in those days. It was not suitable for an academic institution. So these nine men got into a carriage and they rode out the Old Plant Road from Chicago to Milwaukee. They came out a certain distance, and they looked eastward toward the lake, and they got a glimpse, through an oak grove, of the lake, and they said, "This is where we want to start a university."

In order to get to the lake shore, they had to go through a swamp. That swamp is now downtown Evanston. They reached the campus here and founded the University in 1851. They said they wanted to serve what was regarded as the old Northwest Territory, the states from Ohio to Minnesota, which were set up in the time of the Articles of Confederation. It was a day in which there were not very many state universities in this area, so this was to serve the northwestern

area. That is how we got our name.

As you well know, the Northwest has moved on, but we are still here with the same name, and there is no hyphen, unlike the railroad.

At the present time, as I hope perhaps you are aware, we have on this campus seven undergraduate schools. They are tied together educationally by a general education program. For example, in our School of Journalism, 82 percent of the work of the journalism students, for Bachelor's degrees, is in liberal arts, and they are supposed to have at least two majors in liberal arts. In our School of Education, at least two-thirds of our work is in liberal arts. So all our graduates, although they enter through different doors, do have a common experience to some extent.

We have about 6300 or 6500 undergraduates. We have about 2000 graduate students. On our Chicago campus, which, again, is on the lake front, as perhaps you know, we have our professional schools of Law, Medicine and Dentistry, our Graduate School of Business, and a very large evening division. We have evening study on both campuses. The larger section is on the Chicago campus. Altogether we have 7,000 or 8,000 evening division students, plus 2,000 or 3,000 professional students on the Chicago campus, plus a summer session. It all adds up, by the end of the year, to about 22,000 students.

Let there be any misconception, we are the only private university in the Big Ten. In some years the football scores reflect that particular fact. (Laughter)

The University here, as you know, is expanding into the lake. If you have time to go over to the lake shore during the course of your busy meetings, you will see what looks like a vast industrial enterprise going on. We have a large breakwater, a stone breakwater that was constructed last year, and coming up are barges from an industrialized section of Indiana, to fill in 74 acres, just about doubling the size of this campus.

You can ask me why are we doing it, why are we spending 6-1/2 million dollars -- that is what the cost is -- to go out into the lake. The reason we are doing it is this: We need to have space for the facilities that are required for our educational future. We are not doubling the campus in order to double the student body. We intend to keep our enrollment restricted in the future. We may add perhaps 700 to 1,000 undergraduates and a few more graduate students, but we believe our *raison d'etre* is in remaining relatively small. We haven't any more space for our new science structures, for our fine arts complex, and when we began to look around as to where we could put these buildings, we found it would be extremely expensive to buy land in Evanston.

These figures still seem extraordinary to me. To buy the land in Evanston would cost about \$300,000 an acre. We can build an acre in the lake for \$90,000. So that is why it is both cheaper and more aesthetic to go into the lake, and it also keeps the University from taking more land off the Evanston tax rolls -- a rather sensitive point we have to bear in mind in being good neighbors to our fellow

townspeople here in Evanston.

So, as I say, I hope you will take a look at the lake shore, and see what we are doing there.

My hope is that you will not wait another 29 years before coming to this campus again. We hope to have the lake front filled in within the next two or three years, so please come back and see us frequently. Good luck in your meeting.

Thank you. (Applause)

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Thank you very much, Dean Wild. Your statement about your President being in Europe reminds me of one definition I heard some time ago -- the definition of a dean. There are a good many, of course. This one happens to go like this: The dean is the fellow who stays home and tries to make the institution become what his traveling president already claims it is. (Laughter)

We note, sir, that you have a dinner meeting in Chicago and will have to leave soon. We do hope you will be able to come and take part in some of our sessions. Thank you very much.

I am not quite sure how these two spotlights here affect my hairdo (laughter) but Mark Smith asked me if I had my TV makeup on, and I told him no. I left my toupee home too. If you can stand it, I can. (Laughter)

The program now calls for me to introduce the members of the Executive Committee, Officers of the Executive Committee for this year. Before I do so I want to tell all of you how much I appreciate the opportunity of working with these fine men for these past fourteen months. You will discover, as we go through this Conference, that your Executive Committee has been a busy one, a hard-working one, and I am extremely proud of their efforts. For the last two days they have been giving me a bit of a ride about all the ad hoc committees we have set up, some of which you will be hearing from here, but I want to tell you these men have delivered. I have been proud of them.

There are some changes under way in this Association, and we think they are important. You will be learning more about them as time goes on. This has been a wonderful Committee. I have served on the Executive Committees of this Association before. I have never served on a more hard-working one. They are devoted to serving the interests of all of you in this Association, and it has been a productive year.

We are not going to complete all the things we started. We are going to leave some things over for Jim McLeod and the new Executive Committee, but I think you will see as time goes on here during this Conference that this group has grabbed the ball. They have been moving. I think you are going to see some results from them.

Your program lists the members of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee includes our host Dean, Jim McLeod. Our President-Designate, Jim, will take over as

President of this Association at our Banquet on Thursday night.

Jack Gwin -- John P. Gwin, officially -- from Beloit College, has been our Vice President in charge of Commissions. You will be hearing about the work of the Commissions during their reports at our business sessions.

Vic Yanitelli, Father Vic. This program lists Vic as Vice President of Student Personnel at Fordham University. As you listen to Vic being introduced to people, you may have to take a startled second look, because you will hear something about St. Peters. You should know that at the end of this Conference (I guess it is, Vic) he is moving over to St. Peters, in New Jersey, as the new Director of Student Personnel. Do not be alarmed. Vic has done a marvelous job with these committees.

Our Vice Presidents-Designate are Glen Nygreen, Dean of Students at Kent State University -- by the way, hold your hand up. I think most of these men are known. At least we can spot you for some of these new members.

I will go back and start over. We have Jim up here on the platform with us. Jack Gwin -- where are you, Jack? Down here. Stand up so they can see you.

No applause at this time, please, until we have introduced all of them.

Vic, where are you? Good, thank you, Vic.

You will hear from these fellows later. Glen, over here.

Mark Smith, Vice President-Designate, Dean of Men at Denison.

Carl Knox, our Secretary-Treasurer. Carl, down here. Thank you, Carl.

O. D. Roberts, our Conference Chairman, the fellow who, in many ways, has one of the most demanding jobs in the Association. We have a good program ready for you, and you will hear more about it from O. D. in just a few minutes.

Fred Weaver -- is Fred here yet? I have not seen Fred come in. Fred is Past President and a member of the Executive Committee.

John Blackburn, Dean of Men at the University of Alabama. John.

While John takes his bow, and I said this to the Executive Committee last night -- John, I hope you will not

mind my repeating it at this time -- to you and your fine colleagues at Alabama and your wonderful University, our great pride to all of you in the way you handled a most difficult situation, sir. Thank you. (Applause)

Tom Broadbent, a member of the Executive Committee. Tom is Dean of Students, it says here, at the University of California. We should add Riverside. University of California, Riverside branch. Over here, Tom.

R. William Cheney, Dean of Students, Springfield College. Bill is one of my old navy buddies. Bill is leaving us for a couple of years, I think it is. He is going to Nigeria, leaving when?

DEAN R. WILLIAM CHENEY (Springfield): Three weeks.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Three weeks. More power to you.

Tom Emmet, member of the Executive Committee, Dean of Men at the University of Detroit. Tom is over here.

Howard "Hoogie" Hoogesteger, from Lake Forest, a fine member of our Committee. "Hoogie" is not here because he had a commitment in Minneapolis, and he asked to be excused from these sessions.

Phil Price has been a loyal and ardent member, and a hard-working member of our Committee. Phil, from New York University, over here.

Then we list Fred Turner, our Historian, as a member of our Executive Committee. You all know Fred, and you will be seeing him throughout the Conference. Fred, thank you.

And "Shorty" Nowotny, we are going to have "Shorty" up here in a few minutes to give us an announcement about the Committee on Nominations and Place.

I would now like to ask John Gwin to come up and introduce the Chairmen of our Commissions. John.

VICE PRESIDENT GWIN: I am not sure whether all of these gentlemen are here, because I have not been able to get in touch with all of them, but I know Don Winbigler is here, Chairman of Commission I. Don.

I am assuming the chairmanship of Commission II temporarily.

Commission III, Bob Shaffer. I know Bob has been here with the Pre-Conference Seminar.

Commission IV, Henry McCloskey. Is Henry here this afternoon? I know he is here. That is Henry McCloskey from Loyola University.

Commission V, the Chairman is John Alexander. He is not going to be here, I understand, but it is my further understanding that Dave Harris is going to be assuming his lead while he is gone. Is Dave here yet?

Commission VI, Carl Grip, on Financial Aids. Has Carl arrived yet?

SECRETARY-TREASURER CARL W. KNOX (Dean of Men, University of Illinois): He is on campus, but I do not believe he made this meeting.

VICE PRESIDENT GWIN: Commission VII, you will notice their title has been changed from Religious Activities to Student Activities and Values, and Joe Gluck from West Virginia is Chairman of that Commission.

The last, Commission VIII, is Ed Williamson's. Is Ed here? In the back.

Incidentally, meetings of the Commissions are posted on the bulletin board, I understand, by the registration desk.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Thank you, John.

While we are on Commissions, for all of us, a special accolade, a special kudos, to Commission III, Bob, and Don Marsh, and the rest of you men who did such a wonderful job with this Pre-Session Training Seminar. I have heard nothing but wonderful comments about it.

They worked from nine o'clock in the morning until eleven o'clock at night, with the same kind of enthusiasm we had in the old days at Harvard. It has been a tremendous experience, and a real kudos to you men for a real fine job. I wanted to mention this to you men before we went further in this program. It was really well done.

Vic, can you introduce your Committee Chairmen.

VICE PRESIDENT YANITELLI: Fred Turner, the Committee on Consulting Services. Please, would you stand up again, Fred.

The Committee on Cooperation with National Student Organizations, we have had a little switch there, in mid-year, because of some internal difficulties, and we have Bill Toombs as the Chairman of that Committee now. Bill. People who are interested in that see Bill.

The Committee on Fraternity Relations has taken, again, a switch. Ben David is incapacitated by an operation and Roland Patzer of the University of Vermont has taken over, and they are really beginning to roll. I have seen them meeting already, and he is writing like crazy about it. Roland, would you stand up, please.

They are still meeting. (Laughter)

Don Anderson, at the University of Washington, for the Committee on Cooperation with Foreign Student Organizations. That has been changed to the Committee on International Student Programs. Don. Right in the back there.

And the Committee on Membership, Jim Allen of Texas Tech, Lubbock, Texas. Jim.

One more man. We have a liaison with ACUHO, the Association of College and University Housing Officers, but the liaison has gone out of student personnel work and has become the headmaster of a prep school at Mt. Herman. Bob Goodridge, liaison with the American Institute of Architects.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Thank you, Vic.

"Shorty" Nowotny. Is "Shorty" here? "Shorty," do you have an announcement to make about either placement or about the first meeting of your Committee on Nominations and Place?

DEAN ARNO NOWOTNY (Placement Officer, Dean of Student Life, University of Texas): Can I make it right here? This Committee will meet tonight at nine o'clock in this building, Room 220. If you have suggestions, make them to any member of the Committee. They are listed in the program.

... Cries of "Stand up, 'Shorty'" ... (Laughter)

DEAN NOWOTNY: That was Mark Smith.

The Placement Office will be open all day tomorrow, and Thursday, nine to twelve and two to five. Room 220 in this building, Scott Hall.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Your Committee on Nominations and Place is where?

DEAN NOWOTNY: Nine o'clock, Room 220, Scott Hall.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: And your Placement Office?

DEAN NOWOTNY: Same room.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Same room. Very good.

I believe you plan to have the alternates on your Committee meet with you?

DEAN NOWOTNY: Correct.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: All right, very fine.

You noticed in the last issue of the Breeze that Carl Knox invited any of you who might be interested in being editor for this Association to write me. Several of you have responded. We have an ad hoc committee of the Executive Committee, under the leadership of Glen Nygreen. This includes Glen and Bill Cheney and Tom Emmet, who are interviewing today, tonight and tomorrow, so that, hopefully, we can be ready to announce an editor for the Association at our Friday business session. If any of you are interested, who have not contacted me or other members of the Executive Committee, please see Glen or Bill Cheney or Tom Emmet and indicate your interest to them so they can talk with you about it.

Not only are we appointing an editor, but we are also appointing a publications committee, so if you are interested in service to this Association, either in the role of editor or as a member of our new publications committee, please talk to one of these men.

Now I turn to Don Winbigler, Chairman of Commission I, for the introduction of guests. Don.

DEAN H. DON WINBIGLER (Dean of Students, Stanford University, Commission I Chairman): President Jack, fellow Members of NASPA: This Conference promises to set something of a record for the number of fraternal delegates or representatives of kindred professional associations and activities. That, however, is by way of a preamble to introduction of the greatest number of absentees on record. (Laughter)

President Jack has invited representatives from 29 associations, and we are expecting 30 to attend -- that is, 30 representatives from 24 different associations. There were only five who did not respond who were asked to send representatives. One of the reasons for this promising turnout, evidently, is the scheduled meeting of the Inter-Association Coordinating Committee on Friday and Saturday.

By the same token, this means that a number of them probably will not have arrived for this opening session, since they will find it necessary to stay over for Thursday and Friday.

However, the Program Committee, in its wisdom, has set aside this meeting as the time for the introduction of these guests, and we are determined to introduce them at all costs, whether they are here to receive these introductions or

not. So, for those who are here, we will ask them to rise and be recognized. For those who are not, we will list the names for your benefit, so that you can be prepared to greet them individually in corridor sessions.

From the National Interfraternity Conference, we are expecting Mr. B. W. Bennett, Vice President of NIC, and I believe he is not yet here. If he is, will he please stand. There he is. Greetings. My intelligence is not quite up-to-date.

Jack asked you earlier to withhold applause. I happen to believe in audience participation, and I would not be a bit offended if you would like to give him a hand. (Applause)

From the College Fraternity Secretary's Association, Robert J. Miller, President, a member of Phi Delta Theta, and I believe Mr. Miller is here.

Let us see what my batting average is. Well, he isn't. (Laughter)

However, we do have three representatives of the Liaison Committee to NASPA, of this Association, Roy C. Clark of Acacia, from Evanston. Is Mr. Clark here?

VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE GLEN T. NYGREEN (Dean of Students, Kent State University): They have registered, but they are not here.

DEAN WINBIGLER: I see.

Ralph Daniel, from Phi Kappa Psi, was expected, but I understand he has had a heart attack and will not be here.

Bill Verman, from Phi Gamma Delta, and Rex Smith, from SAE. Are either Verman or Smith here?

I should comment especially on Mr. Smith, because he will be our host for the open house tomorrow afternoon, and I feel very grateful.

From the United States National Student Association, the President, W. Dennis Shaul, formerly of Notre Dame. Is Dennis here yet?

Also, from USNSA, Timothy Manring, Vice President, who last year managed to keep Jack Clevenger in shape, out of Washington State University. I guess Tim has not shown up yet either.

From the Intercollegiate Association of Women Students, IAWS, we are expecting Catherine A. Hersey, the

National President, from Pennsylvania State.

From the American Psychological Association, Division 17, Dr. Paul Greene, who is Professor of Psychology at the University of Illinois. Is Dr. Greene here? He has registered.

From the Evening Student Personnel Association, our own NASPA member, George Knerr, President of the Association and Dean of Students at Pace College. I believe he is not here yet.

From the Conference of Jesuit Student Personnel Administrators, Father Hilton L. Rivet, the Chairman of the Conference, Dean of Students at Spring Hill. Is Father Rivet here? (Applause)

From the American Rehabilitation Counseling Association, ARCA, Mr. William Gellman, President-Elect of ARCA. Mr. Gellman is from the Jewish Vocational Service here in Chicago. Is Mr. Gellman here yet?

From the College Entrance Examination Board, Hollace G. Roberts, Director of the Midwest Office here in Chicago. Did Mr. Roberts make it?

From the American College Health Association, Dr. Leona Yeager, the Director of Health Service at Northwestern. I know Dr. Yeager is here. Did she get into the house? Perhaps, like "Shorty" Nowotny, she is just shy.

Association for the Coordination of University Religious Affairs, Dr. William C. Tremmel, President of ACURA, from Kansas State. Is Dr. Tremmel here yet?

From the National Association of College and University Chaplains, the President, whom you met earlier, Ralph G. Dunlop, Chaplain of Northwestern University. Did he leave?

PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE McLEOD: He left.

DEAN WINBIGLER: The Association of College Admissions Counselors, R. Richard Perry, former Secretary of the Board, who is Director of Admissions and Records at the University of Toledo. Is Mr. Perry here yet?

From the College Placement Counsel, Dr. Chester E. Peters, who is the President of the Council and Dean of Students at Kansas State in Manhattan. Is Dr. Peters here? (Applause)

I am not sure whether having a dean of students serve as president of the College Placement Council comes under the heading of professional coordination or professional inbreeding, but we are delighted that one of our members made

it.

From the American Council on Education, Dr. Lawrence E. Dennis, Director of ACE. Is Dr. Dennis here yet? He will be here and on the program later.

From the Division of Higher Education of the United States Office of Education and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Dr. Phillip A. Tripp. I guess Dr. Tripp is not here yet.

From the Peace Corps, Dr. Joseph Kauffman, who has been active in our Association, now is Director of Training for the Peace Corps. Has Dr. Kauffman arrived yet?

From Western Personnel Institute, the recently appointed Executive Director, Dr. John J. Wittich. Is Dr. Wittich here?

From the Association of College Unions, Max H. Andrews, Director of the Loeb Student Center at New York University. Is Dr. Andrews here?

From the Association of College and University Housing Officers, Malcolm Gray, President of the Association, ACUHO, Director of Housing at Mississippi State.

These last three I have named are representatives to the IACC meeting on Friday and Saturday.

From the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, Mr. E. C. Seyler, Associate Dean of Admissions and Records, University of Illinois. I believe Dr. Seyler is expected tomorrow.

From the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Helen B. Schleman, President, Dean of Women at Purdue. I believe Dean Schleman is expected to come.

From the American College Personnel Association, Dr. Dennis Trueblood, the President, currently, from Southern Illinois University, is expected. Is Dr. Trueblood here yet?

If not, I am glad to recognize a change of pace and announce that Dr. Melvene Hardee, Past President of ACPA, is here. Dr. Hardee. (Applause)

Dr. Hardee, from Florida State, is an IACC Representative, and will be here through the meetings on Friday and Saturday.

From the American Personnel and Guidance Association, the President, Willis E. Dugan, is expected, Professor of the College of Education at the University of Minnesota.

Is Professor Dugan here yet?

And Arthur Hitchcock, Executive Director of APGA, is expected.

So much for the list of fraternal delegates. We do have one person here whom I would like to recognize, I have not seen him through these spotlights, but he is one who has traveled a distance here from the University of Nigeria, Dr. E. N. Ukpaby -- and forgive me if I do not pronounce that correctly. I practiced long enough. Is Dr. Ukpaby in the house? I know he has checked in and been active.

On behalf of NASPA, I would like to extend an especially hearty welcome to the very few brave souls who made it to this opening session, and, for the others, we depend on individual NASPA members to extend personal welcomes, and to the guests throughout the Conference.

In this period of concern about fractionalization of personnel activity, in our professional activity in the general activity of student personnel, this is an opportunity to make at least a modest gesture toward inter-professional understanding, unity and good will. (Applause)

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Thank you very much, Don.

Carl, I am glad to see you made it back. Do you have any announcements at this time, sir?

SECRETARY-TREASURER KNOX: Yes, a couple of them.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Carl Knox, our Secretary-Treasurer.

SECRETARY-TREASURER KNOX: There are well over 300 people registered at the present time.

... Further Conference announcements by Secretary-Treasurer Knox ...

SECRETARY-TREASURER KNOX: One final point. There is no indication of position on your badges. For this meeting this was purposeful. We would welcome your reactions. But name and institution are there. It does make for a conversational opening for Green Ribbon wearers, and I would hope we continue the long-standing tradition of your approaching those wearing the Green Ribbon as well, to discuss common areas.

We are here to give service, and that is 211, Scott Hall, starting tomorrow. We will be happy to handle your checks as long as our cash holds out.

Thank you.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thank you, Carl.

I now call on O. D. Roberts, our Conference Chairman, to bring us any announcement he has about the coming program. O. D.

This man has worked hard. He has done a fine job. He has a good program, and I think we got an excellent printing job on it up at Purdue. I want to tell you that we all appreciate the real effort that O. D. has put into putting together this program for us. This is his first experience. He is on a three-year hitch. He has two more years to go. I am sure you have learned a lot out of this experience to date, O. D. (Applause)

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN O. D. ROBERTS (Dean of Men, Purdue University): I am forced to be congratulatory and apologetic in a way. Despite the effort I made to keep the time of the first meeting a secret, I notice that many of you exercised all your native ability as Deans and found it. I congratulate you on that.

I am apologetic, though, about any confusion. I assure you I have it in my notes for next year, and it will not occur again.

... Further Conference announcements by
Conference Chairman O. D. Roberts ...

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN ROBERTS: I think that is about the end of my announcements. I would like to call your attention to a special feature, our Book Exhibit being held again this year, under the direction of Bob Crane of the University of Illinois, and Bob has done a very outstanding job with this exhibit. It is in the lower lounge of this auditorium. We would like to have all of you take the opportunity of seeing the Book Exhibit. Feel free to browse through it as much as you care to.

I am glad that Jack mentioned the program. I would like to urge you to follow the program carefully. We hope you are as excited about it as we are. I am looking forward to hearing many of the speakers we have.

One of the most important helps that you can be, when you return home, within a week there will be on your desk a critique sheet, and I would greatly appreciate your very frank criticism, constructive comments, suggestions on speakers, because this is your program. In essence, you are the Program Committee, and we try to take your wishes into account and build the kind of a session you would like to have.

If we can be of any service to you, or if you have any comments while you are here, please feel free to get in touch with me. Thank you. (Applause)

PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE McLEOD: Just one quick announcement. There is no relationship between such a healthy-looking group as you and announcement of the fact that we do have an excellent university health service. But I thought it would be of interest to those who do have children here. The university health service is across from this building. It has 42 beds in it and a psychiatric department. (Laughter) Doctors and nurses are in attendance.

Seriously, I do want you to know where it is and how you may get in contact. That is for your information.

I apologize, gentlemen, for arranging that tour of the shopping area after breakfast, but it seemed a very interesting thing for the women to do. But it is going to be very fast. They will not be able to buy anything. (Laughter) The stores do open before one o'clock tomorrow, unfortunately. (Laughter)

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Thank you, Jim.

We think you are going to enjoy this program. Those of us out on the Coast knew Mark Hatfield better as Dean of Students at Willamette University. Here is a guy who sat in the chair and took those two a.m. phone calls, and he is quite a fellow. You are going to enjoy hearing him.

If you have not heard Sam Gould, it is going to be a real privilege for you to hear Dr. Gould this evening on the program. We have listened to him on the Coast when he was President at the University of California, at Santa Barbara. He is a wonderful speaker and a man who knows something about our side of the business.

Are there any other announcements we might have overlooked here in getting this Conference under way?

If not, then let us adjourn this session. We hope to see you at our reception.

... The Conference recessed at five o'clock ...

TUESDAY EVENING SESSION

June 25, 1963

The Conference reconvened at seven-forty-five o'clock, Vice President Victor R. Yanitelli, S. J., Vice President of Student Personnel, Fordham University, presiding.

CHAIRMAN YANITELLI: Ladies and Gentlemen: I know you are renewing old acquaintances, I know that you are delighted to see each other after a year's absence, or perhaps even longer, and I also know that the Conference was formally opened this afternoon; but for those of us who have labored on the program, and particularly our Program Chairman, O. D. Roberts, this Conference really does not begin until this moment.

It begins with an extraordinary honor, first of all, that I should be here -- (laughter) -- I feel it personally. Secondly, of course, and principally, that we were fortunate enough to get Dr. Gould.

Now, you can say the usual things about him. He certainly is educated. Bates College, NYU, Oxford, Cambridge and Harvard all had a hand in the thing. And he is certainly an educator, right from an experience that reaches from West Hartford High School through the Speech Department of Boston University, Assistant to the President there, President of Antioch College, and Chancellor of the University of California, at Santa Barbara.

Then, of course, you can sandwich in between that a few years of service for Uncle Sam in the Pacific Theater as a lieutenant commander in the United States Navy, with two battle stars, commendation ribbon and Presidential Unit Citation, with the Bronze Star.

This is just the ordinary stuff that is in the biographical material.

One other item that is factual is the book of speeches he has published under the title "Knowledge is Not Enough." And the title alone makes him very dear and very close to all of us in student personnel, I am sure.

Since he has become our neighbor in New York City, I can tell you this: We all look upon him as a man of courage because he has faced financial problems, labor problems, personnel problems, every possible kind of problem, with intelligence and coolness of mind and will.

Beyond that, he is a man of vision. He is a man who has dared to dream that that miraculous little box called TV, with all its sordid complexities, can be developed into

an instrument for the production of an informed, a gracious and an enlightened citizenship, and these words are his, not mine.

In brief, he is a man who knows what is good, who is not afraid to do what is right, and who has a keen sense of duty besides.

In my own judgment, I think he is the complete, fully developed Renaissance man come back to America in the 20th Century. And so I give you Dr. Gould. (Applause)

DR. SAMUEL B. GOULD (President, Educational Broadcasting Corporation, New York City): Thank you, Father. After an introduction like that, I do not know what anyone can say.

First of all, I had a chance to look at your program when I got in late this afternoon, and I must admire you for your courage. As I see the list of speakers and sessions you have lined up here in the next few days, it makes me feel as though I really should not be saying anything tonight, because you have more than enough of speeches.

Some of you may have heard the story that has been circulating around Washington in recent months about the Senator who prided himself very much on his ability as an orator. After one of his particularly fine efforts on the Senate floor, a very emotional lady rushed up to him and said, "Senator, that speech was absolutely superfluous." (Laughter)

Well, not to be outdone, and wanting to be gallant, the Senator smiled and said, "Well, thank you very much, I'm glad you enjoyed it. As a matter of fact, I'm thinking of having it printed, posthumously." (Laughter)

The lady said, "Wonderful, wonderful. The sooner the better." (Laughter)

It feels good to be in academic surroundings again and to be talking about students. I wish I could reflect to you adequately the pleasure in meeting with a group such as this because of the nature of your work.

While it is true that I seem to be laboring in a different sort of vineyard these days, I assure you that my concern about the student and his welfare is not lessened in the slightest degree. In my view, he is still the center of the undergraduate academic process, the focal point of attention and effort.

A few years ago, while I was Chancellor at the University of California at Santa Barbara, I had the privilege of speaking to some of you who are here tonight. Some

of the things I said then I shall say again, because to me they are still pertinent. In fact, the passage of time seems to bear out my belief that they are even more pertinent. But additional points of concern have occurred to me since then also, and I should like to relay them to you for what they are worth. You must forgive me if I do this in completely unprofessional fashion, since I cannot claim any of your qualifications and can use only instinct and experience as guides. But we are all friends here, and I know you will be charitable.

By way of background, let me speak at the outset of two aspects of the new era in which we live and which relate directly and indirectly to our present and future generations of youth.

The first of these aspects relates to two tremendous paradoxes in the world as we know it today, two major sets of contradictions that should be analyzed for their implications.

One paradox has to do with the adjustment man is finding it necessary to make in his thinking as he evaluates his place in the world. On the one hand, man is more than ever aware of his increasing individual unimportance in the material universe; on the other hand, he is realizing more and more his increasing individual importance in shaping the destiny of the world he inhabits.

Let me explain what I mean by this somewhat confusing statement. Dr. Harlow Shapley, the eminent astronomer, points out in a recent article that we have now had four adjustments to make in our thinking while we have been acquiring new knowledge about the size of the universe. First, the original concept of the earth-centered universe was supplanted by a second theory of a universe centered on the sun. Then, less than forty years ago, came the necessity for a third adjustment in man's thoughts about his cosmic importance. Through the development of new and more powerful telescopes he discovered what Shapley calls a "galactocentric universe." This is simply a high-sounding term which puts the earth and its life near the edge of one great galaxy in a universe of millions of galaxies.

We can all feel ourselves shrink into insignificance as we think of our individual place in these millions of galaxies.

Finally, we are today faced by the arresting question requiring still another adjustment, perhaps the most difficult of all, the question which asks, "Are we alone?" Knowing that millions of planetary systems must exist, can we suppose that life is restricted merely to the earth? Of course we cannot, says Shapley. And the significance and implications of his answer leave the brain reeling. Space

travel is only a tame introduction to this kind of thinking.

Directly counter to this astronomical approach is the development of man as an individual. He may be an inhabitant of one out of billions of planets, but the fact is suddenly coming home to him that his survival on his own planet and the betterment of life on that planet are worthy of his most particular and constant consideration. He studies himself as never before, both body and mind. He values his life and that of his fellow man as never before and seeks constantly for ways to preserve them. And so, as he discovers what an infinitesimal creature he is in the cosmos, he paradoxically is discovering also that his individual stake in his own world, tiny as it may be, is larger than ever before.

The second set of contradictions is simply this: As our technological ability is increasing today with fantastic results in terms of scientific know-how and devices, so is our vulnerability to destruction increasing at the same rate. Again let me explain or illustrate what I mean.

Today, as a great world power, we are involved in a never-ending race with another great world power in the development of armaments of all kinds. Our technological knowledge has led us to discovery after discovery -- the uses of steam, of electricity, of atomic energy, of hydrogen power; the steamboat, the gas engine, the automobile, the airplane, the guided missile and now the space ship. From the earliest single-engine planes with a cruising speed of about one hundred miles an hour we have progressed step by step to the huge jet-engine intercontinental bombers capable of circling the earth in a day or less. From the earliest gunpowder and single shot rifles we have progressed step by step to the hydrogen bomb with the power of fifteen million tons of high explosives, capable of laying waste an area one hundred and fifty times as large as Hiroshima. And at every step of the way during this process of development, we are dogged by another nation, ideologically opposed to us and tenacious in its resolve to keep pace in this mad dash.

Our major dependence for peace seems to rest solely on our maintaining our position in the armaments race. Two nations stand with hands on each other's throats, each equally capable of throttling the other with instantaneous force. This is one of the major fruits of our technology. All of the washing machines and automobiles and television sets and commercial airlines fade into insignificance before the blinding flash of the hydrogen bomb. We live in a never-ending armed truce, not in a world of peace.

What is the way out of all this? How can it be changed? Surely not by more machines, more inventions, more physical discoveries. These are only tools for the use of man as he wills. The answer is a slow, a tedious, a tortuous

one, but it is a sure one if the armed truce will only last long enough. It lies in the development of a disposition on our part to be just as concerned about the state of men's minds as we are about the state of their weapons. And this, of course, is a major responsibility of education.

The second aspect of the new era is less spectacular from a world point of view but of equally compelling concern and very directly related to the work you perform. I am referring to the burgeoning numbers of college students, numbers already in the millions and destined to double within the next seven or eight years. To deal with higher education on such a scale means reshaping many of our present educational policies and recasting many of our methods. I shall touch upon this more fully later on, since it represents an important part of what I want to say about student personnel work.

Before going further, perhaps I should make clear that tonight I am concentrating upon one major portion of the student's relationship to his campus, namely the one that involves him in the impacts and therefore the consequences of his daily living, his social, his cultural, as well as his intellectual activities. The area of personal counseling of the troubled student is a matter quite apart from this. Let me say of this second area merely that I am a firm believer in providing to the student as much of such counseling of the highest professional order as it is possible to make available. And let me say beyond this that I am well aware of how increasingly difficult it is now becoming, as we all grow in size as institutions, to approach this problem adequately. Even though there is an inevitable overlap between psychological counseling and the more general campus activities of the student, I think we might fruitfully examine what the future seems to portend in this latter category. It is to this, then, that I am directing our attention tonight.

There have always been at least two schools of thought about the value of student personnel services as a contribution to higher education.

On the one hand, there have been those educators and institutions who prefer to stand rather completely aloof from the development of any patterns of student relationship other than those of the classroom and the curriculum. In their view, our institutional function is to deal only with the student's mind; whatever else a student does on or off the campus should be his own concern. If he yearns for some sort of organized social activity, let him organize it; if he feels the need of advice, let him take the initiative in searching out its source. According to this philosophy, the institutional responsibility is a purely intellectual one. Anything else has doubtful peripheral value, or may be characterized as a nuisance or even a serious obstacle in the

way of intellectual achievements. We might call this the "sink or swim" theory.

The second school of thought goes almost to the other extreme. Here the preoccupation with the student as "the whole man" (if I may use the term that is bandied about so much) leads to the most elaborate student personnel services, through which experts sit at the right hand of the student in everything he undertakes and even guide him along every step of the way. The inability of the student to make decisions for himself is taken for granted. He must be kept from any sense of failure or even of stress, lest some trauma develop that will mark him for life. He must be led cunningly into participation in all kinds of activity, cunningly since he must think he is responsibly involved while in actuality the decisions are being made by those doing the counseling. Unwillingness on his part to join the group, to serve on committees, to embrace the principle of togetherness constitutes a serious failing, one which is to be deplored. This is the "forced-feeding" or "hot-house" theory.

Most institutions have taken a stand somewhere along a line that runs from one to the other of these extreme philosophies. More are crowded into the area near the second or more protective type, however, even though they would protest mightily if they were accused of such practices. My own observations over a good many years are that far too many of our colleges and universities show an almost unrelenting reluctance to relinquish their total hold and control of the student. Deans and other personnel administrators, in their zeal for smoothly organized programs, orderly processes, and untroubled waters, exhibit a remarkable degree of agility in their ability to rush from one student committee to another so that no point is unguarded and no decision is unsupervised. This is a sure way to immortality, (laughter) since students will always gratefully dedicate their year-books to these indefatigable people who do all their work for them. (Laughter) And college or university presidents, who are constantly being badgered by the community for any student peccadilloes or other irresponsible actions, are happy to have such an arrangement in the interests of good public relations. But it often leaves students with a feeling of restlessness and dissatisfaction at having been so carefully nurtured.

The first step, it would seem to me, toward an appraisal of whether or not an institution is fulfilling its obligations to students outside the classroom is to determine what the institution conceives these obligations to be. What philosophy underlies its student policies and student activities? Is its role an active or passive one? Is the philosophy clearly stated and available so that incoming students and their parents are thoroughly cognizant of the type of campus community they are selecting? To what kind of contract of community living is the student actually committing

himself? These are basic questions, and so I ask them first. You and I could discuss for hours the comparative merits of one philosophy of student supervision over another, but only if we had some tangible statements to use as the foundation of our discussion.

Such statements (or, at least, meaningful ones) are not necessarily found in catalogs or other documents. When they do appear, they are usually a series of generalities with which no one could quarrel, but which are not always an accurate expression of what the student actually will find. It is small wonder, therefore, that the relationship between student and administration often takes on the guise of a battle of one to outwit the other, since under such circumstances the relationship is founded neither upon faith nor upon understanding or good will.

My first suggestion, then, is that every institution think its way through to the philosophy of student relationship it is willing to adopt, that it make this philosophy unmistakably clear to all concerned, and that it pattern its policies, its programs, and its procedures in conformity with this philosophy. If there are to be differences of opinion thereafter, they will not stem from confusion over what the institution's administration is really trying to do.

But let us assume for the sake of our discussion that we are agreed upon a philosophy and that it is neither the extreme of aloofness nor that of coddling. It is one that recognizes the values in developing other than purely intellectual traits in the student. Let us assume that it is one which strives, as Horace Mann said, to avoid creating "the unscrupulous genius" or "the virtuous ignoramus."

How can we fit such a philosophy into the current and future trends of education?

As I said earlier, we find ourselves faced with the most challenging educational question in the history of America, brought into sharp focus by the tremendous flood of students at all levels (but particularly in higher education) which threatens to engulf us. There is no need for me to review the statistics for you, since they are familiar to all. Some people refuse to believe the fantastic proportions of the problem of numbers, but they do so at their peril. We must not forget what this means in terms of expansion of the faculty, additions to non-academic personnel, and the physical development of the campus. The educational question is simply this: How are we to retain and improve quality of experience for the individual student in the framework of mass education? Or, to put it another way, how are we to avoid the creation of a superficial, factory-type approach to education while we, as institutions, grow larger and larger?

In terms of student personnel work, this relentless surge of numbers puts us at a point of reassessment of our philosophy and our methods. We can, of course, fall back upon the principle of aloofness which I outlined a few moments ago, and thus take the easy way out. We can sever ourselves from all responsibilities to the student save those relating to the academic curriculum. Even this will be a difficult task. Under such circumstances, your problems as personnel administrators will be more easily identified and your courses of action made infinitely more clear. You will become in essence a type of professional fire brigade whose main purpose is to extinguish conflagrations as quickly as they break out. It is certainly possible to take the position that the problem of numbers leaves no alternative except to concentrate upon the academic progress of the student and to ignore all else. And I have great fears that in many of our institutions this is precisely what will happen. If it does, we shall be seeing a tragic development in American education, one which will add to the present pressures toward conformity and a machine-like product, and which will make the democratic process weaker and more vulnerable.

Yet, my own reaction is that the problem of numbers gives us a freer opportunity than we have ever had before to replace some of our outworn and outmoded practices, and to make a fresh start along lines we should always have been following. I truly believe the problem of numbers to be a boon and a blessing. Besides the fact that it will lead to the education of a larger percentage of our population, it will also set us upon paths toward sounder educational practice than we have had hitherto.

Because I feel so strongly on this subject, therefore, I should like, even as a non-professional, to offer an eight-point approach to the problem of student personnel relationships. Frankly, it represents what I always urged when I was head of a college or university campus, and my feelings now are the same as they were then.

The first element is a new and stronger role for student personnel officers in relation to administration and faculty.

If you are to assume a more vital responsibility in the total educational process, it is essential that as individuals and as a group you create in the administration and faculty a deeper awareness of your importance. They must acquire more specific knowledge than they now have as to what you can and should contribute. Otherwise you become to them just another one of the peripheral elements of campus life about which they have doubts and even suspicions.

This is not an easy task to perform, but it is a primary one. I wonder, for example, how many times and by

what means your organization has attempted in some systematic fashion to explain your purposes and functions to college or university presidents and deans. Bemused or beset as they are with their many duties, how many of them really know what you are trying to do and how direct a relationship it has to their success as educational leaders? What materials do you send them or what orientation do you give them? Even granting the fact that they are difficult to reach, much less to persuade, what has been the nature of your efforts to do either? And as individuals, what is your relationship to those in authority who can encourage or defeat your work? Have you created opportunities to make yourselves and your functions known so that you can expect to be consulted or included when important plans are being formulated?

I ask these questions not to irritate you but to cause you to consider and evaluate the strength of your present situation. To fulfill your commitments properly and effectively, you must be recognized for the validity and essentiality of what you do. You must be close to where the planning and decision-making take place, close enough to be called upon regularly for an exposition of what student personnel work means as a part of such plans and decisions. You must, by every means you can muster, convince those in authority of the values that underlie your relationships to students. You must demonstrate clearly to them that what you do affects the degree of success the students will attain, and that the activities you encourage are worthwhile in developing the students as persons of responsibility and maturity.

All too often today the student personnel officer is too far removed both in contact or in influence from the major components of the academic process. This is a situation that only your initiative will help to correct.

The second element in this approach is an increased emphasis upon the development of maturity in the student. This should have been our goal from the very beginning; now we have a real possibility of achieving that goal.

You know better than I the current tendency to undersell the youthful generation, to exploit all its foibles and to minimize its positive achievements. We keep our children in a state of adolescence far longer than they should be kept, certainly far longer than children of other nations. We do this out of love and concern, but we do our youth a great disservice thereby. We ignore the fact that they are much more knowledgeable than we were at their ages. We ignore the fact that a great portion of their prejudices and materialistic notions and timidities is an inheritance from us as adults, who have managed either consciously or unwittingly to provide anything but a good example to them. We ignore the fact that they have infinitely greater potential for decision-

making and responsibility than they have ever been allowed to display. We keep them in a sort of advanced nursery where they are expected to play games of make-believe and perpetuate social activities that border on the childish and inane. Yet these young people are at the very age when all the serious decisions of their lives are beginning to impinge upon them. They are filled with doubts and questions and fears and hopes. Most of all, they are filled with tremendous energy, most of which is now being frittered away on unimportant matters.

If we expect the student ever to be able intelligently to govern himself and his country as an adult, we must provide to him the experience of governing himself and his campus world during his youthful years. He must learn now the relationship between authority and responsibility, the relationship between action and consequence if he is ever to be an effective citizen of society. This means that we must rely upon him more and more to undertake active control in areas where we have hitherto been fearful to allow him to enter. He must learn to govern himself more and more by ethical and moral standards and less and less by adult edict and regulation. His ability to run his own life, to develop a sense of purpose, to be individualistic in his approaches to his own destiny must be encouraged.

This is achieved not by taking the student from his sheltered secondary school and home background and tossing him haphazardly into the maelstrom of a free and independent college life. It is achieved rather by concentrating a great portion of the counseling attention upon the incoming freshman, instilling in him with the aid of his upper class colleagues a sense of the mature state toward which he is now expected to move steadily, and getting him to understand, first, the true values of his educational experience, and, second, the independent way he can move toward acquiring those values in a tradition of maturity. It is achieved by working cooperatively with faculty and urging them to recast their academic curricula so that the student is given more responsibility for an independent search for knowledge together with a new realization of the self-discipline required of him as a scholar. It is achieved by reminding him constantly of the Biblical quotation, "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things."

Third, there is a need for a more imaginative attack upon the problem.

We have created a stultifying series of patterns, stultifying in that they have become almost unquestioned and unchallenged over the years and have thus become frozen on almost every college campus.

The essence of this imaginative attack can be stated simply and directly and briefly. It is: Let the student concern himself with things that matter, that really matter on the campus. And to go a step farther, let him concern himself with such things in conjunction with the faculty rather than constantly in the isolated vacuum of student government.

Perhaps I should illustrate at least a few of the activities I mean, lest you feel that I am offering only generalities. It has always been a source of wonder to me that in the areas where the student is very directly involved on a campus, he is so infrequently given any opportunity to be heard. There are endless lists of committees, for example, on every conceivable aspect of campus life, many of which are concerned with precisely those elements impinging directly upon the student, yet such committees are usually restricted to faculty membership. Committees on student living arrangements, on the planning of physical facilities (especially residence and dining halls), on safety, on parking, on loan fund policies, on visiting lecturers -- I could go on and on with the list -- all deal with problems affecting the welfare of the student. But it is a rare campus that finds the student represented on such committees.

To use another example, the operation of book stores, snack bars, and other income-producing activities would appear to be a wonderful proving ground for student experience, as well as a source of employment. But such enterprises are usually kept either completely out of the hands of students or are so carefully supervised from above that the experience is hardly realistic. It seems strange that students majoring in marketing or merchandising or accounting should not be able to utilize their newly-found skills. But this is apparently too chancy an undertaking.

Still another example of a situation in which student opinion could be of service is that involving the search for new faculty. I know it sounds heretical for me to suggest that when candidates for teaching positions come to a campus they should have an opportunity to meet with students. But from personal experience I also know that some of the best appraisals of prospective faculty I have ever heard have come from students. Such appraisals are based upon the students' reaction to the teacher's personality and their estimate of his communicative ability, rather than upon an analysis of his research and writing. Obviously this last is the province of the faculty alone. The need for student reaction to the other essentials of a teacher should, however, not be forgotten.

I could multiply example upon example if there were time. The point is that if we were to take a more imaginative look at what can be done to improve student government and student-faculty relationships generally, we

would be adding many possibilities for maturing experiences for the student. He himself can help us take that imaginative look, if we but give him the opportunity.

Fourth, we need to devise new and better means to bring students and faculty together outside the classroom.

Even the old means are insufficiently exploited, but with the added problem of numbers these must be re-examined and revised.

It falls well within the province of personnel administrators to create the plans for programs which will draw faculty and students closer, and then to persuade both of the potential efficacy of such plans. This is not easy, but it can be done, particularly if the institution's top administrator lends enthusiastic support. Every faculty has a core of men and women who think of the student as a human being, even as a son or daughter. This core can form the bellwether for any newly planned program. This group of faculty can offer leadership in orienting others into the mysteries of effective faculty advising duties; in opening their homes to students regularly; in providing informal places and circumstances where students and faculty meet in small enough groups to have a worthwhile interchange of ideas; in attaching themselves in some quasi-permanent relationship to a part of a residence hall or to a sorority or fraternity; in arranging to have an occasional and leisurely meal with students. Administrators and senior faculty can be helpful by paying some attention, when they are choosing new faculty, to the degree to which the prospect appears interested in young people, whether undergraduate or graduate. Even the outside community can be enlisted to help along this total process in many ways.

Fifth, we need to re-examine existing campus facilities and plan new ones with greater regard for the interpersonal possibilities of campus living.

In the interests of what we look upon as efficiency, we have done great violence to the total educational function.

The cool, antiseptic, and impersonal quality of the buildings designed these days for student use is a reflection of the character of our thinking about education. I am referring most specifically to residence halls, dining halls, student unions, and libraries. It is in these buildings that the student spends hours of every day and night. It is unrealistic to suppose that the nature of his surroundings has no effect upon him; if we believed this, we could altogether forget about the value of aesthetic feeling. The student studies and sleeps in a room exactly like every other room in his residence hall and where he cannot possibly be alone anywhere; he steps from it into a long, windowless and pictureless corridor that represents the acme of institutionalization;

he eats in a dining hall designed for numbers and speed, not for human companionship or conversation; he reads in a library where the very design makes impossible any informal discussion of his reading with his peers or the faculty; he recreates himself in a student union where the major elements are book stores, barber shops, snack bars, bowling alleys, beauty parlors, activities offices, and an occasional hi-fi lounge; from the exterior all the campus buildings that surround him are likely to look more and more like the factories from which their philosophy is derived; and during this entire sterile and machine-like process he is constantly being exhorted to beware of conformity and to be individual and independent. (Laughter) In reality he may not show so much individuality or non-conformity as to put a thumb tack into his bedroom wall except where it is prescribed by regulation. (Laughter)

All this, it is stoutly maintained, is necessary for the sake of economy, and all this I would challenge. It has not yet been proved that with intelligent designing in which educational considerations are paramount, all these facilities could not be supplied within the same budgetary considerations. We have been too willing to accept the judgments of those who have not the slightest concern for the student's welfare except to house and feed him adequately. We have forgotten that a student union, for example, should be an extension of the educational process, not merely a place to get a haircut or buy a coke. We have even forgotten, in the midst of our new realization that larger and larger numbers of our students must necessarily live in the greater community instead of on campus, that it is possible to develop a new kind of community relationship with citizens which will provide a meaningful social setting for these off-campus dwellers.

As personnel administrators, the responsibility for intelligent leadership in these matters is largely yours, since you are inevitably involved with the planning of these structures and the formulation of their programs. Every error in planning and construction contributes to the establishment of a wrong pattern which is bound to persist for the life of that particular building. Your task is first to persuade the administrative leadership to your philosophy, and then to join him in the struggle to achieve what you have both envisioned. You cannot be passive in this and still hope to live up to your visions and ambitions for a dynamic program that looks boldly into the future.

Sixth, we need more emphasis upon preventive measures rather than upon punitive ones.

The task of administering rules and regulations is relatively easy, although unpleasant. It rarely, however, contributes much that is lasting in the student's total education except for a highly intensified desire to lash out

against authority.

There is considerable overlap here with what I have advocated earlier, yet the point deserves special attention. The personnel administrator who guides all his actions according to a definite philosophy pointing toward more maturity and responsibility of the student is bound to move steadily away from devoting the major portion of his time to punitive actions. Indeed, if he is really an administrator at all, he will be spending at least part of every day on long-range planning rather than on the busy work of his office. This is not to say that the latter has no importance. Indeed, it often includes an extremely valuable kind of personal counseling and is highly significant to the student. But once caught in such busy work, the administrator will never find the time or inclination to do anything else, and the personnel program will never acquire any real momentum. This has been the tragedy of some institutions, and it is why they continue to do what they have always done.

Seventh, in planning and carrying out student personnel relationships, we need to concentrate more directly and forthrightly upon the purposes and motivations of the student.

Even though the realities of the situation tell us otherwise, we are normally inclined to take it for granted that a student has come to college for the right reasons and that he is highly and properly motivated in his educational objectives. We thus fall into the error of beginning our work from that point. The result is that we are probably not communicating effectively with the student at all.

In recent years there has been a trend toward bringing the incoming student to the campus early and providing a process of orientation for him. In fact, there are few institutions where a "freshman week" or "frosh camp" or some similar structure has not been created. This is a laudable type of venture, but I think it deserves careful scrutiny. The real value in such concentrated attention upon the freshman is in proportion to the amount of time spent with him in discussion and exploration of what has brought him to the campus, together with the clearest kind of exposition to him of what he reasons for coming ought to be and, indeed, must be if he is to survive academically and grow intellectually. This means developing a freshman orientation that puts all the laborious and hackneyed explanations of extracurricular activities well into the background and that concentrates upon developing in the student a sense of the intellectual privilege awaiting him and the true rewards college life has to offer.

Once the student is assimilated into his new environment, the task changes to one of regularly reminding

him of his purposes and seeing to it that he is brought into contact with people who can continue with him the interpretation of college life and its relationship to the world of thought. Here again the student personnel officer has the opportunity to take an active part, whether it be by suggesting visiting speakers, by arranging an interchange of ideas with students of other institutions, by guiding residence hall and other activities toward less frivolous objectives, or by simply permeating the campus with an atmosphere that takes for granted the acceptance of the student as an adult member of society. The student personnel officer is not simply the head of a specialized office; he is the exponent of a philosophy of collegiate life. And he should say this so clearly and so often that his role is unmistakable.

Finally, we need more data on student characteristics, and the systematic or organizational means to obtain such data.

A proper program must be geared to the particular abilities and propensities of a particular student body.

I cannot emphasize this element too much. Most of what I have said before loses its validity if it is based on mere guesswork. If we are to make some accurate gauge of how much we can accomplish with a group of students and how rapidly we can move toward such accomplishment, our judgment must be based on intimate knowledge of our student body makeup: their academic strengths and weaknesses, their socio-economic backgrounds, their previous experience in student affairs, their emotional difficulties, their values and motivations. These and other items are vital information if we are to make intelligent plans. Furthermore, as these data are gathered from year to year, they constitute a source of comparative study. They can be used in a myriad of ways, ways that will occur to you more easily than to me.

With an adequate organizational pattern, it is possible to evaluate much of what is being done which may be new or unproven. It is also possible to explore the student's record long after he has graduated or left, as a way of discovering clues that will help in future planning.

I do not minimize the difficulty attendant upon obtaining funds to establish the data-gathering process, for I know that to many people it seems an unnecessary frill. But I would urge that you fight hard for creation of this systematic function, for it is the heart of your whole enterprise.

You have been patient to hear me out, and I hope you have recognized my wish not to be critical but helpful. I have tremendous admiration for the work you do and an increasing realization of its importance. In the times that lie

ahead you can be even more of a factor in shaping the total campus life and in putting a humane spark into each student to offset the mass pressures upon him. Nor can I imagine a task more exciting and more satisfying than yours, for you work regularly with the very essence of the educative process, which is the personal element. Others may turn students into experts; you have it within you to turn them into vital, effective persons. I congratulate you on your opportunity and wish you well.

Thank you very much. (Prolonged applause)

CHAIRMAN YANITELLI: I take it, Dr. Gould, that you will conclude from the applause that we have felt a new stimulus, a new challenge to our own creative thinking, and a new challenge to our own vision in seeing what we are trying to do when we look at ourselves every night or every morning in the mirror.

Dr. Gould has graciously consented to take a question or two, if you are interested, but please do not feel obliged in this instance. (Laughter)

Well, with that, I would ask you to give Dr. Gould another hand, and we will conclude the meeting. (Applause)

... The meeting recessed at eight-forty-five o'clock ...

SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

The Conference reconvened at nine-five o'clock, President-Designate James C. McLeod, Dean of Students, Northwestern University, presiding.

PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE McLEOD: Gentlemen, will the meeting please come to order.

As you know, the purpose of this particular convocation is that we may have the opportunity of hearing from the President of NASPA, who has served so well and in such a distinguished manner throughout this past year.

I can say this from first-hand experience. Never have I received so many communications, so much information, and felt that the direction and the destiny of NASPA was in better hands than they have been with the one who is going to speak to us this morning.

If we were bringing in a speaker from anywhere else, into our midst, we would be sure to inform those who were to listen concerning his background and his achievements. I am not going to embarrass Jack by telling you a great deal, but sufficient to say that he started out as a Kansan, that he did his undergraduate work at Colorado A & M, went on to Stanford, received his doctorate, and then returned to his alma mater where he served in a variety of capacities, including alumni secretary, assistant to the president, dean of students, and then served Uncle Sam well in the navy during World War II, after which he came to Washington State, at Pullman, Washington, as Dean of Students.

So I give you our President, Jack Clevenger.

(Applause)

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thank you very much, Jim, for those kind words. It would be nice if they were true.

I must admit to some degree of ambivalence as I set about the task of preparing these remarks for this morning's session. In fact, I think I was somewhat like the story that concerns a certain Father Kelly, one of Vic's brethren. Father Kelly was allegedly riding by plane from New York City to Chicago. He was an old hand at this business, but his seat companion was enjoying his first plane ride, and he was one of these fellows who obviously was not sure that airplanes are here to stay. So he was filled with great anxiety. No sooner had the plane taken off from Idlewild, headed for Chicago, than, looking past Father Kelly, out the window, he saw trouble developing on the inboard starboard engine. The engine began to smoke, and soon

stopped. The props were feathered. At this point he began to nervously nudge Father Kelly, and said, "Father, Father, is that engine stopped? What will we do? What will we do?"

Father Kelly shook his paper a couple of times and kept on reading, and, shortly thereafter our friend observed trouble in the outboard engine. Sure enough, soon enough this engine stopped also. There was considerable vibration and, obviously, tremendous anxiety on the part of our friend on the plane. Father Kelly was still unconcerned. But our friend just could not take it any longer. He shook Father Kelly and said, "Father, Father, you're the only man on this plane who can help us on this plane. Do something. Do something."

Father Kelly, still unconcerned, again shook his paper. He said, "Young man, I would like to be of assistance in this situation. I'm sorry that I can't. You see, I'm in sales, not in service." (Laughter)

Well, as I prepared these remarks for this morning I was troubled by whether my role is supposed to be sales or service. I have actually entitled this "The President's Report." It is not scholarly, it is not profound. It is merely my sincere and earnest convictions about this Association.

You will remember that two years ago in Colorado Springs -- and a year ago in Philadelphia -- I tried to say to you how deeply I appreciated the honor you paid me when you asked me to serve as President. And now, as my year in this office comes to a close, I want to say to you once more how much I prize my years of association with NASPA, and how grateful I am for the rewarding experiences that came to me through the opportunity of serving as an officer of the Association, with the highest reward represented in the opportunity to increase my acquaintanceship with and appreciation for so many men for whom I hold the very highest esteem. It has been the high mark of my career as a teacher and student personnel worker, and I repeat, I am deeply grateful for it.

My closest association in these past two years has been, of course, with the Officers, the Executive Committee, and the Commission and Committee Chairmen, and I commend them to you for their performance in serving the Association with distinction. We are better as individuals and as an Association because of them. Perhaps it is not quite "cricket" to single out names, but as a matter of conscience I feel I must point out how much indebted we are to Carl Knox, and the countless hours throughout the year he gives so ably as our Secretary-Treasurer; to Vice Presidents Jack Gwin and Vic Yanitelli and their capable coordination of Commissions and Committees; to O. D. Roberts who has worked so hard on this Conference and who, as Conference Chairman, in many ways has

the most important and most demanding responsibility in our Association; to Glen Nygreen, Mark Smith, and Tom Broadbent, who have served as chairmen of Executive Committee sub-committees about which you will be hearing more later; and to the others on the Executive Committee and on the Commissions and Committees to whom we are all indebted. To all of these men, and for all of us I say thank you, from the bottom of my heart.

You may recall that last year in Philadelphia Fred Weaver chided me gently for not attempting, as President-Elect, a "chart the course" address in which I could outline the work in the year ahead. I should tell you in all frankness that I demurred for what I considered to be a rather valid reason. I was convinced that NASPA, in keeping with the dynamic changes that are taking place in higher education, is in a period of important changes also, and that I just simply needed more time and more help in forming firmer opinions about any possible changes in course for the organization.

I attended my first NASPA Conference at the Broadmoor Hotel in Colorado Springs in 1952, and it has been my good fortune to be among those present at each succeeding Conference. My predecessors in this spot on the program have been men who left their imprints on the Association and who had important things to say to us about the role and responsibilities of the Dean and about the role, history, and future of our Association. Last year Fred Weaver talked about both the Dean and the Association with an eloquence that produced respect and envy in all of us who had the good fortune to hear him; the year before Bill Guthrie gave us his thoughtful and provocative analysis of the Dean's role, entitled "Three Hats for the Dean, and Three Cheers;" and in 1960 Fred Turner reviewed for us the history of NASPA with all of the knowledge and insight that only this great servant of our Association could bring to such an assignment. And I could go on back year by year, but time does not permit.

Now it is my turn, and I wish to address myself to a discussion of our Association -- the current scene, the changes that are taking place, and some personal hopes and ambitions for it for the future.

I am guided by our discussions in Executive Committee these past two years, by discussions at our annual conferences, by recommendations from our Committees and Commissions, and by the thoughtful comments by colleagues in their recent letters.

NASPA, as we have known it in the past, presents an image of intimate and warm friendships, of close relationships and fraternal fellowship, of camaraderie, of earnest sharing of experiences and ideas, and of a kind of closeness that typifies a small organization. Many of our members have

felt that our limited size put us in a unique position of personal communication among a large percentage of the membership and, thus, an enhanced opportunity for maximum effectiveness. We have been inclined, some of us, to compare our small organization with such large ones as APGA and then express anxieties about "getting lost in the mob" and feel that our uniqueness is threatened by the possibilities of growth in size.

I understand these feelings and, in looking back over a decade of experience in this organization, there have been some high points of personally rewarding experiences with close friends and colleagues that I shall always remember and cherish. Certainly for me, and my colleagues of the occasion, that first seminar at Harvard in 1954, I believe, for some 60 of us, was one of the great experiences in NASPA. We shall be forever indebted to Commission III and Whitey Rollins and his colleagues, the men at Harvard who organized and carried out this fine series of highly productive seminars which involved so many of our members at places like Harvard, Austin, Philadelphia, Purdue, and Carmel, and now these last two and a half days for some 70, here at Northwestern, I know it is a wonderful experience for you.

We found the skillful application of the Harvard Case method to studying problems in student personnel administration to be an exciting and very stimulating one with thoughtful analysis, intense personal involvement, and strong agreement and disagreement being the order of the day. But there was much more than this -- there was fellowship, camaraderie, the happy hours with the enthusiastic, and perhaps not too skillful, glee club (accompanied by Fred Turner at the piano). Yes, these experiences and many others like them produce feelings of nostalgic appreciation of the past, and the hope that some of them can be a part of our future.

Early this winter I asked each member of the Executive Committee to write me concerning his views of the future of NASPA, who and how it should serve, size, name, functions, relationships, etc. I was delighted with the thoughtful response and their contributions were highly valuable to me as I tried to develop a rationale for my own convictions about the future of NASPA, and as I developed this presentation.

Several members of the Executive Committee, and many of you who responded to a questionnaire sent out by Tom Broadbent's sub-committee -- you will hear about this later on -- commented on this question of potential growth and in some cases there was an expression of somewhat reluctant admission that growth would appear to be inevitable.

I recognize that there are those among our membership who contend that our particular genius rests in our small size and intimacy and that we should not change this.

I must disagree with this position. Not only is continued growth inevitable, as I view it, but I also think that growth, as I interpret growth, is very desirable. In spite of our nostalgia, I think most of us would agree that we and NASPA cannot live in the past any more than the whole of higher education can live in the past. As Don Winbigler put it, "the desire to turn back the wheels of time is in direct opposition to the desire to make NASPA a primary professional organization exerting real leadership in the field."

Whether we like it or not, and whether we realize it or not, NASPA, in my opinion, is in an important state of transition, imposed in part from within as we react to our changing roles and responsibilities and partly from without by changes that are taking place in the academic world, by society generally, and by the changing patterns of behavior of the people with whom we deal.

As I see it, growth and change is an inevitable part of the future of our organization if we are to continue our historical pattern of commitment to serve our membership.

Within this growth and change there is great challenge for us. We are as much committed to individualizing our experiences in NASPA as we are to individualizing the educational process of our students. Therefore, there is an obligation before us to preserve as much as we can of some of our characteristics of the past which we all value so highly. By this I mean the kind of interpersonal relationships that are based upon warmth, fellowship, and empathy of the highest order. At the same time we must seek to promote and facilitate each member's participation and involvement in organization programs, committees and discussions in order that the individualization which we prize will permeate all facets of the Association. Whatever the coming changes will bring in our organization, and come they will, I would hope always that our primary concern will be with the opportunity that is before us to serve increasingly the needs of our individual members, as they serve the educational needs of our nation. The heart of our concerns in NASPA is with individualizing our programs, projects, and concerns as we strive to serve better our men and our educational goals.

As long as our efforts are earnestly directed to serving these goals, growth will be inevitable. We will grow in number of institutions represented in the Association. Look at the last decade alone. In 1953 we had 229 member institutions and today we have almost 400 (396 to be exact) which is an 80 percent growth in a short ten years time. We will grow in service. We will grow in quality. This in turn will result in growth in influence, and this will lead to increased services, on a national level, to bodies and councils that represent groups of institutions as well as to

governmental agencies.

The challenge then, as Vic Yanitelli puts it, is "to be able to meet, absorb, and reflect healthfully the changes that are being imposed upon us by all these forces at work in the national academic life."

One of the geniuses of our Association, I am convinced, rests in our institutional membership (as opposed to individual membership) and I strongly recommend that this be maintained in the years ahead. I would hope also that we can continue a policy of open attendance and participation by other than institutional representation from the institutions with large student personnel staffs -- in other words, I would oppose any attempt to limit attendance and participation from any one institution.

It would be a serious mistake, in my opinion, to attempt to establish any kind of an elite of either institutions or institutional representatives, because this could only lead to impairment of our responsibility for leadership in our profession.

At present our membership represents approximately 30% of the accredited four-year institutions of higher education in this country. If we are seriously committed to the service of higher education, it would seem that we can do nothing other than welcome to membership those institutions that meet our membership standards.

We are cognizant of the growth trend in membership and, in my opinion, this trend will accelerate as we improve the quality of our programs and services. How fast we grow in numbers will depend not only on quality of program and services, but also in part on how aggressively we promote an expanded membership. I am confident that our Committee on Membership is giving continued study to our policies in this area. I would venture the prophecy that we will grow to the point where, at some time in the future, we will give serious thought to implementing a plan for subdivision on a regional basis, with possibly annual meetings of the entire membership scheduled for every other year.

One additional problem that I would like to re-direct to the membership committee is the matter of our relationships and services to the rapidly growing two-year community college movement, the most rapidly growing segment in higher education today.

We have quite a number of four-year community colleges in our organization and I wonder in what ways the responsibilities of the student personnel programs and the student Deans differ between the four-year and the two-year community institutions? I am aware of certain differences created by emphasis on both vocational education as well as

college preparation, but it would seem to me that (1) the two-year institution is a part of our nation-wide system of higher education and (2) students might well bring the same kinds of needs to both the four-year and the two-year community colleges. As I read our statement of purpose, I am not sure of the grounds on which we exclude the community colleges and their student personnel deans, other than the requirement that membership is restricted to accredited four-year institutions.

Several of my former staff members are now student deans at Western community colleges. When we meet annually at the Northwest College Personnel Association meeting, we seem to share common interests and problems; theirs on a somewhat more limited basis to be sure, but we still share and we still try to be of help to each other. This might also be true in NASPA. The question, quite simply, is where does the community college student personnel dean look for professional leadership -- to NASPA, or one of the other associations -- or should he develop his own?

In the ten annual conferences that I have attended I have observed a continually increasing emphasis on (1) programs based largely on stimulus coming from the subject matter disciplines pertinent to work with students in higher education and (2) concern for the roles and goals of higher education. I urge that we continue this emphasis as we plan for the future because it represents to me a proper concern for the professionalizing of our work. At the same time we obviously cannot ignore our concerns for administrative matters in student personnel services. These should continue to occupy our special interest sessions, but in my opinion this program ought not to be centralized on these concerns. What we must continue to stress is the intellectual content behind our practical problems.

I have indicated earlier that a constantly increasing broad program of services to our member institutions is a necessary part of our growth as we look to the future. Included in this I would envisage an expanded publications program, increased emphasis on placement, expanding in-service training programs, increasing the productivity and service of our commissions and committees, and other elements of service already familiar to you from our recent history.

As I have already indicated, at the first meeting of our Executive Committee in Philadelphia last April, I appointed four sub-committees, ad hoc committees -- I have taken quite a bit of kidding about this, incidentally -- from the membership of the group to take the lead in studying and presenting recommendations for possible action. These were: the sub-committee on budget and fiscal matters headed by Mark Smith; the sub-committee on name and function headed by Tom Broadbent; the sub-committee on a secretariat headed by Fred Turner; and a sub-committee on publications headed by Glen Nygreen. Three of these sub-groups will be presenting

reports during our coming business sessions but I will comment on these briefly in advance of the reports.

Most of you are well aware of the discussions that have been taking place within the organization for some time on the problem of publications. There has been considerable division of opinion on such matters as (1) Utility and cost of the Proceedings, (2) advisability of establishing a NASPA "Journal," (3) changing the "Breeze" to a newsletter-type of publication, and (4) publishing in brochure or reprint form those papers and articles coming from our annual conferences, and reports on other NASPA related activities, which would be of special significance for the student personnel field.

At our meeting in Chicago in February, based upon recommendations from Nygreen's sub-committee, your Executive Committee took the following action as the initial move in improving services in the publications area:

1. Approved the establishment of the position of an Editor for NASPA. This is provided for in the Constitution.

2. Approved the establishment of a committee on publications.

3. Approved the publishing of a quarterly newsletter.

To your Executive Committee, these appeared to be the necessary first steps if we were to move off dead-center on publications responsibilities. You will be hearing more about this when Glen Nygreen reports at the business session.

Last year in Philadelphia, Shorty Nowotny presented to the Executive Committee the request that he be relieved as the head of our Placement Program. Shorty stated that he had enjoyed his years of service to our organization in this role but that he felt, quite frankly, that it was time to turn the responsibility over to a younger man. The request was considered carefully by the Executive Committee but we delayed action on the matter pending further study -- in part, I think, because of our affection for Shorty and his impressive record of service to our Association. Then, as most of you know, Shorty was quite ill during the fall and early winter months and the Executive Committee then found itself in the embarrassing position of having complicated matters for him by not accepting his recommendation on change at the time tendered. Thus, belatedly, and reluctantly, the Executive Committee, at its February meeting, made the move to shift the placement responsibilities effective with the end of this Northwestern Conference. We are pleased that Dick Hulet has agreed to take on this responsibility and we have encouraged him and his committee to study carefully our

placement responsibilities and present recommendations for any changes needed to make the program more effective.

Is Shorty here? Is Shorty still out there at the Placement Office? I wish he were here, because I want to say this to Shorty.

As Shorty now turns these placement responsibilities over to Dick, as he asked to do some fourteen months ago, a real deep and a heartfelt "thank you" to Shorty, not only for his long years of unexcelled service to NASPA, but I think most of all, our thanks for the warm and great friend that he has been to all of us.

As I mentioned earlier, one of the important sub-groups formed at our first Executive Committee meeting in Philadelphia was the sub-committee on budget and fiscal matters with Mark Smith as Chairman. Mark, as is his habit, and with his customary timidity, (laughter) wondered out loud why I wanted him to head this particular task group when (according to him) an assessment of his talents would tend to indicate that his particular brand of genius is not in the area of finance. However, I pointed out that I was sure that Mark knew this Association and that he is known as a worker and producer -- and frankly, I am very pleased with the work of this sub-committee. During the coming business sessions you will have the opportunity to discuss and then vote to either accept or reject our recommendations on increasing annual dues and the Conference registration fee.

I strongly urge your support of our Executive Committee recommendations on these two items. You have had the report in your hands for some time and you have had ample time to study it and discuss it with your President. I will not anticipate Mark's report, and arguments for the need for the increase, but I do want you to know that I consider these to be the vital first step we must take if we are to move aggressively forward in realizing some of our hopes and ambitions for this Association.

Those of you who were in attendance at Philadelphia last April will remember that Fred Weaver bequeathed to me the privilege of "grappling" with his recommendation that we change the name of the Association. I attempted to meet this challenge by the traditional procedure of appointing a committee, within the Executive Committee, to study and report. Tom Broadbent and his group have been a hard-working sub-committee and many of our members have been involved in answering questionnaires and writing letters in response to requests coming from Tom and the committee. We tied a review of function into the review of this committee because we felt purpose and function of the organization had an important relationship to its appropriate name.

This committee will report at one of our coming business sessions and you will have the opportunity to make

a decision as to whether or not a proposal to change the name should be placed before the membership later in the year.

I must confess to you some personal feelings of ambivalence in this matter, although in more recent months I have taken the position that we would be wise to include the word "Dean" somewhere in our title. I say this in spite of the fact that my review of scores of letters on the topic from members reveal a rather sharp division of opinion.

What I hope is a realistic appraisal of our present title reveals the following to me: (1) It does not indicate any particular tie to higher education, (2) the term "personnel" is a somewhat ambiguous one and not altogether too palatable to our academic colleagues, and (3) our constituency, in terms of faculty, students, alumni, and parents, does not relate very well this title to our roles and titles on the campus. In fact, most non-student personnel people on the campus and in the community are somewhat mystified by the title.

In my own case, when our Conference Publicity Chairman sent the news home to the local home town newspaper that I had been elected to an office in this Association, the dear old Pullman Herald carried this story heading: "Clevenger to Head Student Group." (Laughter)

At the same time I must recognize the problem created by the lack of uniformity in titles for our institutional representatives. Perhaps some of you, in considering this question, have already followed the procedure used by a long-time friend, Arden French of L.S.U. Upon receiving his 1962 Proceedings he analyzed the 397 in attendance by title designation and found that those present included 125 Deans of Men and Assistant Deans of Men, 167 Deans of Students, Deans of Student Affairs, and Assistant Deans of Students, and 105 that he classified as "miscellaneous." Thus, the only common denominator, if there truly be one, would appear to be the title "Dean."

Jack Gwin brought out what to me is an important point when he said, "although it is not unusual for individuals to inquire as to 'what a dean does,' for some reason or other the title 'Dean' carries with it a connotation of dignity and status which seems to be well-known by everyone. I think without question that we cannot say this of the term 'Student Personnel Administrator.'" I repeat, it is my recommendation that we give serious consideration to changing the name of the Association to include the word "Dean."

While I was busy appointing sub-committees at our first Executive Committee session last spring, I thought I might as well cover (or shotgun) the "water front" so I asked Fred Turner to chair a sub-committee to study the possibility

of someday establishing a secretariat -- and by this I meant the establishment of a paid executive for the Association. Shortly thereafter, and perhaps belatedly, came the recognition on my part that certain other decisions had to be made regarding the future of the Association before any serious consideration of a secretariat could be undertaken. Thus, Fred's committee has been stymied. However, we are currently making decisions as an Association which will shortly give this committee the green light and thus I strongly recommend to Jim and the new Executive Committee the continuation of this committee.

This Association will be forever indebted to Fred Turner and successor Carl Knox for the selfless devotion, the countless hours, and the time stolen from family, in carrying out so ably their responsibilities as Secretary-Treasurer of this Association. As the Association continues to grow in size and complexity, the responsibilities involved in this office become ever more demanding until in the not too distant future our collective conscience will say to us that we have reached the end-point of volunteer association service that can be reasonably expected from any member regardless of degree of commitment to serve.

I need not remind the membership that in Carl Knox we have a committed and highly competent servant of this Association to whom we are deeply indebted and for whom we hold such high regard. But I repeat, however, there is a reasonable limit even to the most devoted voluntary service. As we look ahead we must find some way of resolving this problem. Appointment of an editor and publications committee and the establishment of the newsletter will give some relief, but the basic problem will still be with us.

It is my belief that most of us feel the real heart of our Association rests in the work of our committees and commissions. Herein rests the opportunity for widespread active participation in Association activities by our membership and here a significant portion of the membership has its only real opportunity to make a contribution to the increased effectiveness of our colleagues, our Association, our profession, and higher education in general.

For some time the Executive Committee has been aware of the need for considerable reorganizing and streamlining of committees and commission structure and this was never more apparent than when we began to study the budget needs of these groups. In spite of the fact that we have made certain changes, additions, and deletions, the fact remains that we turn over to Jim and the new Executive Committee much unfinished business in this area. In retrospect, however, I would point out that anyone with significant experience in higher education recognizes that quite often changes can be a rather slow and painful process. I would also suggest that continued study and re-structuring of certain

aspects of committee and commission responsibilities will continue to be a part of the primary concern of the Executive Committee for a good many years to come.

Jack Gwin and Vic Yanitelli will be in charge of those business session activities concerning reports of the commissions and committees and I have asked each, at the beginning of their reporting sessions, to review briefly the changes that have taken place in the last two years.

This year, we asked the commissions and committees to prepare their annual reports early enough to be duplicated and ready for distribution to all of you as you registered for this Conference. We knew that it would not be possible for all groups to comply with this request because (1) some needed to get together at conference time to complete their reports and (2) it does take time to implement fully this kind of change.

I recommend that in future years we set deadlines early enough for submission of reports from committees and commissions so that they may be compiled, printed in a single publication, and issued to the membership at least 15 days prior to the annual conference. This would give you time to study them before coming to the conference and would save important time in reporting at conference business sessions because this would permit confining reports to decisions and actions on recommendations being presented. This would also reduce printing costs on the proceedings.

One further matter I think quite important in considering the future of commissions and committees is the urgent necessity to provide for at least some degree of turnover of members if we are to give our younger and able members ample opportunity to serve the Association. We have a number of competent and dynamic young deans in this Association and, in my opinion, we must assiduously search them out and put them to work. The future of our Association is very much dependent on this yearly infusion of new blood and men who are ready to roll up their sleeves and go to work.

Perhaps the answer is to appoint commission and committee members for a period of service, say three years, fashioned after the plan used by so many of our institutions in appointing members to standing faculty committees. Jim, this is just one more problem I bequeath to you and your new Executive Committee.

Over the years we more than once have heard Ted Zillman rise to his feet in plenary sessions to stoutly present his view that action was being taken by the Association on matters before it without due regard for time needed by the members to carefully and thoughtfully weigh the evidence in the situation. On this point, and on certain types of problems that are before us, I must agree with Ted.

Now, I do not wish to infer here that I think all matters of business coming before the Association needs advanced study by members. Instead, I am referring to such matters as our stand on the fraternity membership clause problem, our consideration of changing our dues pattern, our resolution of last year on federal scholarships, and certain others on which we voted as institutional representatives and, I stress, as institutional representatives supposedly representing an institutional point of view.

I think, for instance, that we made a mistake last year at Philadelphia when we listened to a report from Commission VI and then immediately voted, at the end of the report, to take a stand supporting federal scholarships and a stand to remove the ceiling on NDSL institutional allotments. I believe there were only two dissenting votes. Then at least 50 or so of us representing Land Grant Institutions discovered when we got home that our vote on federal scholarships was in direct opposition to the position on the matter taken by the Land Grant Association and by our Presidents.

I recognized the problem on timing, etc., that was before us last year and thus permitted the vote to be taken. However, if I could go back and do this one over I think I would have asked your permission to allow Carl Grip to provide you with proper ballots so that you could have gone home, discussed this matter with your staff and with your president and then mailed your ballot to Carl Knox, voting an institutional point of view in accordance with your credentials as institutional representatives.

As we look to the future, I stress the importance of voting as institutional representatives, and particularly on matters involving external relationships and concerns.

One of the problems of our Association that has troubled me for several years has been the undercurrent of feeling, by many of our members, never really brought into the open, that programs, policies, and key positions in the organization are manipulated and controlled by the large school deans and by the committee on nominations and place. Some of you were courageous enough to speak to this problem in your letters to Tom Broadbent and John Blackburn. I see no need for this matter to stay beneath the surface and I say it is time to face this one head on, resolve it, and then get it behind us and forget it.

You are aware of the minority report from the committee on nominations and place two years ago which expressed concern about the succession of the large school deans to the office of president of this Association. It is easy to recall the recent order of succession which reads Stanford, Illinois, Ohio State, North Carolina, Washington State and Northwestern.

Without disclosing origin, I would like to quote briefly from some of the letters that came to Broadbent and Blackburn, as follows:

1. "We can attend the national meetings and also have an opportunity to rub shoulders and gain insight from our brethren from the larger institutions, but as you probably know, the chief administrators on the larger campuses seem to flock together, therefore jeopardizing the opportunity to gain from the experience of others."

2. A second dean said, "For the past four years I have not attended. My reasons are perhaps not good ones but I found they were not as personal as I wanted, that the boys from the big campuses bring along an entire crew plus a group who are looking for jobs and much of the meetings are devoted to letting these fellows feel their wings."

3. A third dean said, "My interest started to flag, however, when it became apparent that only a small group of people would ever have the opportunity to contribute to the organization and its function."

4. A fourth dean said, "It is my opinion that the Association should take every possible and reasonable means to cultivate the smaller liberal arts colleges."

To you men with the green ribbon, let me explain that the committee on nominations and place is composed primarily of the former presidents of this association. Needless to say these men have been our strong leaders and men committed to effective service in this organization. Several years ago members at large, elected by the membership, were added to the committee, in part to help answer the covert criticism of some that this committee operated as a "closed corporation." This action, apparently, did not fully resolve the problem, and there are those among you who still have your doubts.

I say let us examine openly and talk frankly. If a majority of you, for instance, feel that we would be wiser to have our nominating committee place on an election ballot the names of two or more candidates for each of the elective positions and have the ballot handled through the mail, as certain other associations do, then this is your Association and democratic rule prevails.

To be consistent with my approach to other problems, and with the backing of the Executive Committee, I have appointed five respected men in our Association as an ad hoc committee to sample feelings, thoughtfully analyze, and then report to the Executive Committee on their findings on this problem. These men are Don DuShane of Oregon, former President of the Association, Chairman; J. Gordon Brown, Stuart Good, M. L. Huit, and Father Pat B. Ratterman.

I am not proposing action on this matter at this time. My preference would be for the membership, the committee on nominations and place, and the new Executive Committee to give thought to this during the coming year. If any action appears to be called for, I would prefer it be taken when we meet next April in Detroit.

You are aware of discussions that have been going on in student personnel circles as to whether or not ACPA will separate from APGA and the need for a new alignment or possibly an amalgamation of present college student personnel organizations into a new kind of "big top." Many of you, as am I, are members also of ACPA, and have watched with wide-eyed interest, these past fifteen months particularly, what some of my ACPA friends have termed the "power play and the struggle for recognition" which has occupied so much of the time and attention of the current leaders of ACPA and many of the rank and file, as the conflict continues over possible ACPA action to withdraw from APGA. I am not critical of them for it, for they are merely struggling for a place in the sun -- for recognition -- for their organization, and to overcome what some of its members claim to be an attitude of lack of self-confidence.

After attending the recent APGA-ACPA meeting in Boston, I am more convinced than ever that the handwriting is on the wall -- that in the end ACPA will sever from APGA for some rather obvious reasons. APGA is dominated by the "guidance" interests of secondary education -- and I have no quarrel with their interests. Anyone with experience in college and university work surely must recognize the wide breach between the high schools and the colleges in so many areas -- and especially is this true in student personnel responsibilities. In fact, guidance is the term of secondary education. The only persons I find using it on college and university campuses today are our friends in the schools of education who conduct guidance institutes and train guidance workers for the public schools. Furthermore, the term "guidance" is a rather unpalatable one to many of our faculty colleagues on the campus.

I use these prefacing remarks about ACPA and APGA to reinforce my position that NASPA must continue to take leadership in the attempt to try to relate the plethora of professional organization in the field of student personnel work -- but -- and I stress this -- without seeking to dominate them. NASPA, through the work of Commission I, has taken the lead in the attempt to make IACC, the Inter-Association Coordinating Committee, the coordinating agency for student personnel organizations. The exceptionally effective work of two of our IACC sub-committees this year, the Joint Commission on Financial Aids, led by Carl Grip, and the Committee on Preparation of Student Personnel Workers, led by Tom Emmet, demonstrates the leadership we are taking in this coordinating effort.

I am convinced more than ever that IACC can become the co-ordinating agency that so many of us have talked about. (It has been proposed that we change the name to COSSO - Council of Student Service Organizations.) I see no opportunity whatsoever for any kind of an amalgamation and/or restructuring of the organizations presently represented in IACC into one single college student personnel organization -- nor do I think it wise for the attempt to be made. There is a certain genius in each of the present student personnel organizations and in our individual autonomy rests much of our strength and vitality. This individual autonomy, I repeat, must not be threatened by IACC or any so-called "super" organization.

For the past two years I have been talking with and corresponding with a number of people on the matter of the influence of the student personnel movement on those organizations and agencies where vital decisions are being made regarding the future of American higher education. In February, I made a special trip to Washington, D. C., to talk with officials in such organizations as the A.C.E., the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, and others, regarding relationships. (As an aside, one of the results was the invitation from President Logan Wilson of A.C.E. to submit a selected list of our members whom he could consider in making appointments to A.C.E. Committees.) Mr. Laurence Dennis of the A.C.E. is meeting with us this week and with IACC on Friday afternoon and Saturday as visible evidence of the A.C.E. interest in the student personnel movement and its potential contribution to higher education.

The result of all this investigation, in my own personal conclusion, is that the college student personnel movement, represented by almost 25,000 people and over 20 national associations, cuts a "very thin slice of pie" in Washington -- a reaction which is neither unique nor startling and one which I am sure is shared by many of you.

The excellent progress being made by our IACC joint commissions on student financial aids and on professional development is evidence enough of the need that is before us, as student personnel organizations, to present as strong and united a front as possible and to continue the effort to coordinate our common interests on selected overlapping problems.

The Inter-Association Coordinating Committee is a brave attempt to serve these ends. In its formation stages thus far it has been beset with such problems as lack of continuity in members, competing interests at APGA meeting time, and some degree of uncertainty on program and goals -- but as I have already indicated, it is my opinion that we are finally on our way, and that we can iron out our problems and arrive at a productive program that will serve the

interests of all.

Our Inter-Association group commences its meetings here at 2:00 p.m., Friday, immediately following the conclusion of this Conference. Many of the representatives of the other associations in IACC are here this morning and these, and others coming later, will be with us throughout our Conference. We are very pleased to have them with us.

We in NASPA are about to embark upon an exciting new adventure and a new first for the Association, under the leadership of Commission VIII and with the help of a substantial grant from the Hazen Foundation. I refer to our study in depth of the student and his involvement in social and political issues as outlined to you last April in Philadelphia by Chairman Williamson in reporting from Commission VIII's proposed study. You will be hearing in detail about the plans for the study when Williamson reports during the business session.

Embodied within the potential of this study is the opportunity for the voice and leadership of NASPA to be felt throughout higher education as we uncover information that will give us greater insight into coping with one of the important areas of controversial issues on the campus of our day.

I suggest that this study opens the door somewhat wider to the opportunity that is before us to make of NASPA an open forum for debate and thoughtful investigation of the cross-currents and controversial issues which influence our approaches and philosophies of dealing with students, and this is as it should be if we are to fulfill our self-concept of educators and leaders. Neither the deans on their campuses nor this Association can carry out their mission if they deal only with the safe, the comfortable, the harmless, and the non-controversial -- or perhaps they can, if the object is sterility.

To continue to move and expand our efforts in this direction will take courage, commitment, and vision of a high order. However, for those who like adventure and challenge this can introduce an exciting new dimension to the scope of NASPA responsibilities. As we look ahead we must be alert to opportunities for research and finding new ways to increase our activity and visibility in the areas where research monies are dispersed and where policies with regard to higher education are influenced.

I would like to suggest one further area which I think should be given detailed study by our Association and I refer to the need for a code of operating principles for the Dean and his administrative relationships. By this I mean the development of operating or guiding principles for the student personnel dean in his administrative relationships to:

1. The president and other key administrators
2. His own student personnel staff
3. Students
4. The teaching faculty

These administrative relationships are an important part of our everyday lives on the campus and yet nowhere in the literature or in the past history of this organization do I find the guiding operating principles laid out concisely and clearly.

Finally, and by far the most important, whatever direction we take as an organization and whatever we become-- at whatever level and at whatever time -- the student always must be central to our concerns. From my own particular biased point of view, it seems to me that it is the student who is in danger of being lost in today's highly complex higher education.

As the world of knowledge expands around us in geometric ratio, as automation, mechanization, and scientific developments of our space age bring impersonalization to our everyday lives, as pressures for conformity operate at the peer group level, and as the pressures of the modern day academic world tend to separate the faculty man from close personal contacts with his students, it is the Dean and the student personnel staff who carries the first line of responsibility for personalizing the educational experiences of our students.

We all know full well that there is no "halo" effect operating here and we realistically recognize that this responsibility has been pressed upon us by default of the faculty as the result of forces over which they have little or no control.

It is easy for me to look back for more than a quarter of a century to my own undergraduate days and recall my friends in the faculty who left their impressions on me. I have long since forgotten most of what I was once supposed to have learned from these fine men, but I shall be forever grateful for what they did for me because they simply took a personal interest in me as an individual. I wonder how much time these same men might have today for taking a personal interest in the individual student in our modern-day university, dominated as it is by "publish or perish," "bring in the grant money," and "confine your activities to those things that bring academic prestige to yourself and your academic field if you are to achieve status in your profession."

Perhaps this problem is brought into its sharpest

focus in the book "The Academic Marketplace," wherein Caplow and McGee refer to the faculty as persons whose mobility and status is determined by their relationships within their academic disciplines and not by their record of service to the employing institution. They point out that not very many years ago a faculty member moved ahead by his on-campus relationships and his record of service whereas today he advances by the extent to which he is in demand by other institutions as a member with status in his discipline. Therefore, as Glen Nygreen pointed out in a recent letter, the tasks of service once performed by the faculty are now relegated to a form of academic civil service, and, as he puts it, "it is with this offhand but cutting classification that we (student personnel staff) are largely dismissed today."

It is redundant, I know, to ask who loses in this situation. Obviously it is the student, who comes to us with his dreams and ambitions which can be too easily shattered by the reality of campus life in which the essential disinterest of the teaching faculty promotes a student-created defensive climate. There are exceptions, of course, and on every campus we find at least a few members of the teaching faculty who continue to take a keen personal interest in their students and who can somehow find the time for individual counseling, for attending retreats, and for serving as faculty adviser to student groups. Most of them, however, are caught in the trap of the rigors of their academic discipline from which there is no escape. And we should not be too critical of them for this, for they, like we student personnel administrators, want to be experts at their professional calling and high scholarship today leaves little time for students and institutional service.

Thus, we find ourselves in the paradox where we recognize that it is the student who must prosper if higher education is to achieve its goals; yet it is the student who tends to be lost. You ask, who is there to look out for him? And I suggest that more and more it becomes the responsibility of those whose identity has been referred to as the "academic civil service," or the student personnel staff.

I have made these comments about the urgent need always to keep the student central to our concerns to support my strong contention that there is a unique and distinctive place in American Higher Education for our institutional membership organization, NASPA, to represent the institutional concerns for the welfare of students. NASPA clearly recognizes the need to identify strongly with the employing institution while at the same time drawing much of its stimulation and ideas from the pertinent and substantive academic disciplines.

Surely thinking men everywhere know that our

colleges and universities are democracy's investment in its own future. Dwight Eisenhower, in a recent address said, "In a very real sense America's first line of defense runs through the university campuses. Likewise, they are the shock troops in the battle for peaceful solutions of the world's problems."

This complex and anxious new world for which we are preparing our young people is a paradox of internationalism, iron and bamboo curtains, and strident nationalism. Emerging nations, civil rights, hydrogen bombs, and exploration of space are of utmost importance to every discipline on the campus.

It is our unique opportunity to be a part of America's superb system of higher education, and to help it reach every student in a personal way that promotes the full development of young minds and hearts so that they will be able to cope adequately with the great opportunities and responsibilities of their day and age. In fact, it is more than an opportunity -- it is an insistent necessity, a delight, and a test of our ideas, of our techniques, and of our faith.

It has been my privilege this morning to place before you my views on the future of NASPA. It has been an even greater privilege to serve an organization which has such a strong hold in my own mind and heart. No greater good fortune could have come to me than to be identified with an organization whose intrinsic worth is so clearly demonstrated through the high quality, the distinguished performance, and the deep commitment of its members. How rewarding it is to work with men who search for broader understandings without a need to advance their own personal interests or inflate their egos. It is these qualities, I think, that helps us look to the future of NASPA with the confidence that we will be able to stretch our horizons without limit and to challenge our complacency without hostility.

Daniel Webster sounded our keynote for us over a century ago when he said, "Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote its interests and see whether we also, in our day and generation, may not perform something to be remembered."

Thank you. (Prolonged applause)

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: As the novelist had his character say: "Some of us make the world, and others of us live in it." Some of us participate in NASPA and work in it, and others are dedicated to it. Certainly that must be said of Jack and his administration this past year.

... Conference announcements by Chairman McLeod and Conference Chairman O. D. Roberts ...

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: Thanks very much.

If there are no other announcements from anyone present, you are dismissed. Coffee is being served in the lounge.

... The Conference recessed at ten-ten o'clock ...

FIRST BUSINESS SESSION

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

The Conference reconvened at ten-forty-five o'clock, President Clevenger presiding.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Let us get this show under way, gentlemen. I call to order the first business session.

I want to, first of all, make a statement about resolutions and repeat what was said last year. As you know, we have no resolutions committee. You will be considering resolutions from two of our Commissions. You already have these in your hands. Any others of you who have a resolution you wish considered, will you please submit them to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee meets tomorrow night following the banquet, old and new, and at that time we will be happy to consider resolutions and see where we go with them in terms of Friday's business session.

... Conference announcements by President Clevenger ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: As an assist to us in these business sessions, it has been customary in the past to assign to Don DuShane, the fellow in that colorful green shirt down there, the role of Parliamentarian. With your concurrence and Don's concurrence, Don, will you serve, please, again, sir?

DEAN DONALD M. DUSHANE (University of Oregon): Yes. Should I go back and change my clothes? (Laughter)

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: No, no permission to change clothes.

Last night, following Sam Gould's address, several of you came up to us and asked if it would be possible to have this talk of his reproduced in time for it to be in your hands before the close of the Conference. Normally, this would appear in the Proceedings, and this would be some five or six weeks away. How many of you would be interested in seeing if we can get Leo's organization to reproduce this for

us so we can have it for you by, say, Friday morning?

It looks like most of you would. All right, Carl, will you pick up on that. We will try to have it to you, then, before the close of the Conference Friday morning.

O. D. Roberts -- is O. D. here yet? O. D. is missing.

I next turn, then, to the annual report of our Secretary-Treasurer, Carl Knox. Carl.

SECRETARY-TREASURER KNOX: Fellow NASParticipants: In your registration packet each of you should have received an Annual Secretary's Report and what was labeled "An Interim Treasurer's Report." In the Secretary's Report there was a very important omission. This was that in the course of this year NASPA has become a constituent member of the American Council on Education, which moves it from associate status to that other and more important and more effective role.

This was authorized under the regime of President Fred Weaver and that Executive Committee. However, the American Council was undergoing certain changes, and they held our check and requested that we await their reorganization. But I am happy to report that to you and I apologize that it did not show in our Annual Report because it is, I think, a very important move on the part of NASPA.

The Treasurer's Report was labeled "interim" for this reason: During the course of this year our Executive Committee put the organization on a set and established fiscal year, from July 1 to June 30th. It also authorized that not only should your Treasurer be under bond -- this was at his own request -- but that there be an audit by an accredited C.P.A. firm for total distribution. So I can promise you this distribution sometime in August, after we close out here, get all our bills in, and that will be the official report, and that explains why the Treasurer's Report you have in hand was labeled "interim."

Now, just a couple of quick observations from my vantage point of five years as Secretary-Treasurer.

To me, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators is building on a fine, solid past toward a remarkable future. Our tribe increases. Even though the report shows 396 members, there are two additional membership acceptances and checks lying on my desk in Urbana. That is a 398 total. One of our representatives here has also paid for a new membership. We do not quite have the paper transaction completed, as far as any written communications, however that is 399. And of the 29 pending, there are a number of member institutions that are merely waiting for their new fiscal year, starting July 1, and so you will see another jump of our accepted members by the time our next Newsletter comes out.

The Career brochures put out by Commission III, thanks to Bill Brown and Jimmy Allen, and then Don Marsh, up at Wayne State, where the printing was done, first a mailing was made to all NASPA institution representatives. Then a mailing was made to all non-NASPA deans throughout the country. Then the remainder was sent on down to me and we put those Career brochures out on the basis of fifty a day as long as we had them, and the well ran dry some two months ago. But with the correspondence coming in, even in some instances where it was explained there was not a charge, some high school guidance workers still sent in two dollars, or one dollar in their envelope. It was very gratifying, and I hope some quick action will be followed, if a possible rewrite is necessary, that this will be accomplished so that we can catch up with a backlog of some 60 or 75 requests that now exist downstate.

If you recall, late last summer a distribution was made of a legal paper by a certain Mr. O'Leary, and John Templin. This was The Student and Due Process, and it was to appear in the local Law Review of the Illinois Law School. That establishment has not quite recovered yet from the 250 requests for copies that were on hand before the official publication came out.

Why am I citing these? I would just like to say I think our scope and shadow is widening. Our relations with the American Council on Education that have been cited here, and you will hear more about the Inter-Association Coordinating Committee, the activities of Commission III and Commission VI, have all contributed to this.

I would like these gentlemen to know, and I was pleased this morning to see thirty men or so down in the book exhibit, that we will, if we run true to form, have some 60 to 100 requests for copies of that book list and book exhibit, based upon last year's experience. And if you have not taken a look at that, I just hope you will before you leave the Conference.

This has been a real working period of fourteen months, from an example set by our President on through, and inclusive of many of you men sitting out there, and in the diversity of our constituency there is a great potential for progress. As a favorite TV program of my son's, when we first moved into TV territory, always signed off, "There are thrills ahead, Rangers." (Laughter and applause)

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Thank you very much, Carl. Are there any questions of Carl before we continue?

Is O. D. here?

One of the ad hoc committees I mentioned was our ad hoc committee on Name of the Association. I had asked Tom Broadbent to head this sub-committee and make this report for

us this morning, from the Executive Committee. Tom's father-in-law passed away yesterday afternoon, and so he has asked Phil Price to make this report for the sub-committee. Phil.

DIRECTOR PHILIP PRICE (Ad Hoc Committee on Name of the Association, New York University): Thank you, Jack.

Gentlemen: Ad Hoc Committee 13-B (laughter) entitled "The Committee on Name," has, as you have heard earlier this morning, circulated questionnaires and letters of inquiry pretty much throughout the various regions of the membership of NASPA. As a result of this we found that almost no one is ambivalent about the matter of name, and it is a highly emotional question.

It is the purpose of this Committee, therefore, to recommend to the joint Executive Committees, as they meet tomorrow evening, that during the course of next year institutional representatives have an opportunity to learn all the points in favor of a name change, all the points against a name change, with a view to arriving at a final decision at the end of the year at the annual meeting.

Clevenger's Ad Hoc Sub-Committee 13-B Prime (laughter) on Function has spent most of this year trying to keep up with Clevenger, his vision, his excitement, in foreseeing what this organization can do and proceeding to get it started in those directions, has given us the job of verbalizing his effective work.

Less than an hour ago you heard a good many of these things. We feel that in verbalizing what he has done there are about six areas concerning this function.

The first of these areas will indicate, as the continuation of this Committee's work for the next few weeks, his concern and the concern of all of us with the centrality of the student. To use Jack's phrase, "with the centrality of the student in our work."

The second phase will have to do with our own study of the work that we do with the student in mind, in reference to study and what research this organization can carry out.

The third phase will emphasize the importance of the annual meeting and the opportunity there for study, discussion and training.

Four will have to do with our responsibility to represent the broad field of student personnel services, not only internally within the institutions, with whom we are concerned, but in all areas of interest with higher education.

Five, the fifth phase, has to do with our responsibility to provide leadership and training for young, and

even older people, who come into this field with a view to carrying it out successfully.

And, finally, to cooperate fully with all organizations at all levels which have a relationship in the area of student personnel services, and to proceed to develop and think along the lines of Jack's reference to regional associations today.

This, roughly and in general, is what the Committees on Name and Function will be reporting to the Executive Committee, and will in turn report to you during the course of the succeeding year. Thank you.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Thank you very much, Phil. Any questions of Phil before he leaves?

This Committee, incidentally, was Tom Broadbent, Phil, and John Blackburn and "Hoogie" Hoogesteger. Briefly, we think the function is a continuing concern for each successive Executive Committee. It is going to have to be.

This matter of the name is going to be more carefully reviewed. All the information, pros and cons, the thinking on it, will be placed in your hands with the hope that you will discuss it in your regional and state meetings, and with your own colleagues on your own campuses, so that you will come to Detroit next April prepared for some action on this particular problem. Is that right, Phil?

DIRECTOR PRICE: Yes.

DEAN JACK MATTHEWS (University of Missouri): Do I understand a motion is out of order at this time to change the name of the organization?

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: I think, Jack, this would not be in keeping with some statements we made here about a problem of this kind being given proper time for study and consideration. I would not personally want to bring this matter to the floor for a vote at this time because I do not think we have had ample time to really study it and give it our very best, and see what this Committee has had time to develop and place before you.

DEAN MATTHEWS: I understand we have studied this about a year, so I thought perhaps that might be sufficient time. But I certainly yield to the judgment of the President.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: How do the rest of you feel about it? Are you willing to accept this proposal? Jack, the full results of the study and thinking of this Committee has not had an opportunity to be presented in full to the entire membership, and I simply think it should be. Maybe you want to proceed faster than this, Jack, and I respect your

opinion, but this would be my preference for it. But this is your Association, gentlemen. What do you want to do about it?

DEAN SHELTON L. BEATTY (Pomona College): Mr. President, would it be permissible, even if we were not going to vote, to hear some ideas and not run away with the time? If the gentleman has some special suggestion he might want us to hear, it might be of some advantage for us to hear what he has in mind, even though we do not vote on it at the present time. If that is permissible, may we have more ideas that way?

DEAN MATTHEWS: I know time is of the essence. I would make a motion that we change the name of this organization to the National Association of Deans of Students.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Is there a second? Is there a second?

DEAN O. W. LACY (Trinity College): I second the motion.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: The motion is seconded. Discussion?

DEAN BEATTY: Mr. Chairman, I did not try to get you in the position of having a motion made and seconded. I simply was trying to open the field here to hear some ideas and suggestions. (Laughter)

VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE GLEN T. NYGREEN (Dean of Students, Kent State University): Mr. President, I see nothing wrong with having this suggestion on the minutes, but I would like to defer action, and, therefore, I move to table until the next annual meeting.

... The motion was duly seconded ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Mr. Parliamentarian, this is not open to debate, I believe.

DEAN DONALD M. DuSHANE (University of Oregon): No, it is not.

DEAN DEAN W. HOLDEMAN (Oberlin College): This is not debate on this. I would suggest, however, as Beatty suggests, if the Committee that has been looking into this has names, titles, that they might read them just for information at this time.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thank you.

DIRECTOR PRICE: I do not have that information with me, Jack. I'm sorry, Tom has it.

VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE NYGREEN: But this is one of the names --

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: This is one of the names, I know. There are some others. Are you ready to vote on the motion to table?

... Calls for the question ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Question is called for. All those in favor of tabling this motion please say aye; opposed. It is so ordered.

Jack, I did not mean to cut you off. Do you have anything further to offer at this time? Anything else?

DEAN MATTHEWS: Thank you, sir. Absolutely nothing.
(Laughter)

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Okay. I now turn to a report from Glen Nygreen. We are going to have two sections of this report. I want Glen to give a report from the Sub-Committee on Publications, and, doggone these guys, they have sure had fun kidding me about these ad hoc committees. I will not give you the number of this one. I want Glen to talk about the work of this Committee, and we hope to be able to announce at the Friday morning session the appointment of the editor and the new publications committee.

I told you yesterday how these fellows work, and during all the corridor sessions and opening sessions under way this special committee has been busily interviewing men who have indicated an interest in being Editor of this Association. It has really been a hard-working group. We have had some pretty lively debates in the Executive Committee meeting over what we do with publications, but we will hear from Glen.

VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE NYGREEN (Ad Hoc Committee on Publications): Thank you, President Jack.

I want, first, to take advantage of my being at this rostrum for a point of personal privilege. I realize that the question of college fraternities, about which I wish to make a statement, is sometimes in our group an opening wedge for a big discussion, but I simply want to say that my own college fraternity relationship has been a warm and meaningful thing to me over many years, and I, as the newly installed National President of Sigma Alpha Epsilon, want to call your attention to the item in the published program noting an open house at the LeVere Memorial Temple at four-thirty this afternoon.

The LeVere Memorial Temple is less than a block from here, immediately east of the new Alice Millar Chapel. It is

also the location of a couple of the seminar sessions scheduled in the program. We would very much like to have you come and see this Temple, the headquarters of what we think is a large and responsible national organization. If you cannot come at four-thirty, it is open during business hours all this week, and the visitation staff, most of you will know one of them. The visitation staff is there, and they would be delighted to be your host. So if you will pardon me, Jack, for calling attention to that item on the program.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: There will be no charge.
(Laughter)

VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE NYGREEN: No charge? All right.

Now, this is, in effect, a report of an ad hoc committee consisting of Tom Emmet of the University of Detroit, Bill Cheney of Springfield College, and myself, which has been received by the Executive Committee, and therefore represents our present situation.

There has been discussion for some time of what ought to be an appropriate publications program for NASPA. We have been grateful for the work of our Secretary-Treasurer, and his predecessor, in establishing and publishing the NASPA Breeze, in the publication of the annual proceedings of the Association, and in the occasional release and distribution of substantive items useful to all of us.

We have likewise been impressed with the active publishing program of the American College Personnel Association, and we have realized some need to see if there were some gaps in the publishing programs in the student personnel field which might be of particular usefulness to our membership. And this is our orientation -- usefulness to those of us who, as student personnel administrators, may have some needs now presently not being met.

When we began this program we had no recourse to any larger budget, and so the basis on which it now exists does not predicate action to increase the annual dues, although obviously, if this program is to move very far, there must be more funds available to it from this Association.

President Clevenger has referred to some concern about the proceedings. Past President Fred Turner points out that this is the only association which has a continuous record from its inception of its business and program sessions.

We have chosen, for the moment, not to alter that. We will continue the proceedings for at least through this Conference, as they have been published, and will review this during the year ahead as our remaining publications program

develops.

We did recommend to the Executive Committee that there be appointed an editor, that this be an annual appointment, and that this person, if possible, have an ex officio relationship with the NASPA Executive Committee.

We hope to have by Friday morning a recommendation for you. We recommend the appointment of a publications committee, to which the editor is to report. And the chairman of the publications committee is to be someone who is already or is for this purpose named a member of the Executive Committee.

I want now to comment upon relationships with the American College Personnel Association.

There have been discussions with the Editor of the Journal of College Student Personnel, Mr. Charles Lewis, Dean of Students at the University of Tennessee. The job that has been done with the Journal of College Student Personnel has won the admiration of all of us. It is making a successful attempt to become a scholarly journal in our field, which would have stature equivalent to that of scholarly journals in other disciplines.

The interest of ACPA has been to give this Journal as wide circulation as possible. A study of our membership indicates that over half of the NASPA representatives are members of ACPA and already receiving this Journal. We want you to know that we would encourage the rest of you subscribing to this Journal, there being a three dollar annual subscription fee available to you as members of this Association.

We will see that this information is carried in the Breeze, or its successor, which I shall describe in a moment, and we want you to understand that we are in no sense moving toward any competition or duplication of this significant effort in the field. So therefore, please, no one read into this any attempt on our part to institute a rivalry of some sort.

We want to leave hanging the question of any possible future relationship with the Journal of College Student Personnel, to be worked out by future committees, as events develop.

We recognize that the continued load of the NASPA Breeze upon the Secretary-Treasurer is an imposition, that his load has grown greatly as the Association has grown. We recognize that the Breeze, by whatever name viewed, ought to become a regular, printed, content-oriented publication.

Bill Cheney asked all of you what your wishes were and compiled an impressive report of your thinking along this

line. Tom Emmet did a very distinguished job of reviewing the publications of all related associations, and a number of you have seen his report. The Executive Committee reviewed their publications.

We, therefore, have recommended the establishment of a NASPA Breeze or other named newsletter to appear four times a year, to be centered around not only news of the Association, news of developments in our field of interest to us as administrators, but also a content publication as contributions from the membership and the ingenuity of the editorial board may dictate.

We hope to begin this with a fall issue, and to have, therefore, been able to have appear at least two issues between now and our April meeting in Detroit.

There are other publication matters having to do with occasional monographs or other materials of usefulness to us, and these remain matters of future consideration as this whole publications movement becomes somewhat decentralized from our present efforts.

With that, President Jack, I move the acceptance by this body of this progress report from the Executive Committee on a publications program for NASPA.

DEAN EDMUND WILLIAMSON (University of Minnesota): I second the motion.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Any discussion? The motion is to accept this report from the Executive Committee. Hearing no call for discussion and hearing a call for the question, all those in favor please say aye; opposed. It is so ordered.

Thank you very much, Glen. This Sub-Committee, as you can see, has done a great deal of work, and we appreciate it, Glen, very, very much.

I now turn to John Gwin. We have followed the practice, in these business sessions, of asking the two Vice Presidents to handle the reports of the Committees and Commissions. We will start this morning with the reports of Commissions, and I will present John Gwin, Vice President in charge of Commissions.

... Vice President John P. Gwin assumed the Chair ...

CHAIRMAN GWIN: I am not going to report on each Commission individually; however, I would like to give you a few of my impressions of changes in the Association's outlook over the last couple of years. I think we can really take some pride in the work that has been done by these Commissions and the Committees, provided we do not become

complacent, for I think there is no question but what the Association, through its Committees and through its Commissions, has taken action which will definitely affect our standing in the general field of higher education.

I think there are three aspects of this, primarily, and I refer specifically to activities in the area of inter-association cooperation, attention to legislation, and training and development of our student personnel administrators.

In the area of efforts to cooperate with other associations, I think we have a real debt to Commission I, which, as you probably recall, was largely responsible, vitally responsible for the establishment of the Inter-Association Coordinating Committee.

The associations cooperating in that venture are the American College Personnel Association, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, Association of College Unions, Association of College and University Housing Officers, the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, National Association of Foreign Student Advisers, and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Commission I also is now engaged in making a study of the various regional deans associations, to determine the purposes, functions, and possible implications or associations with NASPA, and Don Winbigler's report will probably be coming to you later, on the efforts in that area.

I would also like to refer to the cooperative efforts in Commission III, through Tom Emmet's work with the development of training procedures and ventures with the Inter-Association Coordinating Committee, and further with Carl Grip's Commission VI, on Financial Aids, which has also become a rather sizeable and influential group, and I would like to read you the groups he has been cooperating with through his Commission; namely: the American Personnel Association, with two representatives; the National Women's Deans, with two representatives; the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, two representatives; and, as you may know, there is a Midwest Association of Student Financial Aid Directors, which has been formed in this area, with approximately 100 institutions represented, and the President of that group has been working with Carl's Commission too, as a joint commission.

I indicate these things just to point out to you the efforts that are being made of a cooperative nature by NASPA, and I think gained real acceptance.

In the area of attention to legislation, these same Commissions, primarily, have been meeting with representatives of governmental bodies in Washington, in an attempt

to provide information to them which will be of assistance to them in legislating, in the study of problems which are before them.

Here again, Commission III and Commission VI have been vitally interested.

In the third area of training, which I think you recognize, the Association has for some years now been active. I think you all are happy to see that Commission III again has taken the ball with their Pre-Conference Seminar, and many of you here, I know, have participated in that, and are getting a lot out of it.

They are also, I believe, as you will see in their report, advocating the possibility of regional seminars, and this again is an effort on the part of NASPA, through its Commissions, to carry their responsibility for the training and development of our younger men.

I would like, before moving to the reports, to mention two items which might be of interest to you in the Commission area; namely Commission VII, which was formerly the Commission on Religious Activities, has had its title changed to Student Attitudes and Values, the purpose here being to broaden the scope of the Commission's responsibility, for it seemed to be the feeling of the members of the Commission that the narrowing of its functions to religious activities stymied it in carrying out its business. So it is now called the Commission on Student Attitudes and Values, with Joe Gluck presently the Chairman, and they, we presume, will be coming up with a report, perhaps next year.

The other Commission I would like to mention briefly, Commission IV, we seem to be experiencing some difficulties of overlapping function and purpose in Commission IV with perhaps two or three other Commissions. So at the present time we are studying this with the possibility either of revising its functions or perhaps dropping the Commission altogether.

This morning we are going to have two reports, one from Commission VIII and another from Commission III. I would first like to call on Mr. Ed Williamson, from Minnesota, to report on Commission VIII, and while he is coming up I would like to say that we owe a real vote of thanks to Ed and the members of his Commission, because they have done an excellent job the last two years in finally bringing this experiment or ideal that Ed has had for the study of the student attitudes in areas of civil action and civil interests to this point. They have some good news for us, and I would like to have Ed, if you will, come up now and make the report for Commission VIII.

DEAN E. G. WILLIAMSON (Chairman, Commission VIII, University of Minnesota): Mr. Vice President, Mr. President, Fellow Deans: The problem our Commission has been wrestling with for two years grows out of a proposal, the origin of which I am not clear. I think the Historian really ought to find out whose idea this was, because I think it may prove to be a very productive idea. But, at any rate, over two years ago I received a letter from Bill Guthrie, then President, inviting me to serve as a chairman of an ad hoc committee to study and to formulate a proposal for a study of students' expression of their points of view on various issues.

Under Fred Weaver, the Executive Committee appointed the Commission, and we worked for two years to try to hammer this concept of freedom of expression for students in their status as students -- not in their status as citizens -- into a research proposal. I will return to that concept in a moment.

This last year, under President Clevenger, we have been engaged in trying to raise \$50,000, which was our underestimate of what it would cost to make a respectable field study about the phenomenon which we loosely call academic freedom.

Now, as you know, there is a good deal of opinion about the nature of freedom, in the capacity of studentship. There is also a little fact, but there is almost no verified fact. And it is the third category we hope to explore, and to delineate among the opinions a fact, those verified facts, not with any idea of coming out with an orthodoxy of belief, or with a standard ritual of campus observation. A rule book, a manual is not what we want.

The American principle of diversity of practice among institutions is, we hope, unassailable. So what we are trying to do is not come out with a standard operation for a dean of students with respect to the complicated problem of what constitutes acceptable and desirable freedoms for students.

As you well know, the whole concept, as well as the practice of freedoms of students outside the classroom, in their status as students, on and off campus, is a very complicated one, and a most confused one.

We inherited the problem -- I should say we inherited the concept which constitutes the problem of what is academic freedom, from our German forefathers. About the time that President Elliott came to Harvard from Berlin, he brought with him the concept of akademische freiheit, academic freedom.

There were two parts to the old German tradition. One was lehren freiheit, the freedom to teach, to profess,

the professor's conclusions after he had studied various problems, documents and issues, and the lernen freiheit, or the freedom to learn on the part of the students. And a freedom to learn, on the part of the students, consisted of a number of rather specific freedoms, as they had evolved in the very loose cultural evolution of the German student life.

There was, as you will remember, the freedom to attend or not attend lectures. There was the freedom to transfer readily, without registrar's red tape, from one institution to another. There was the freedom to live where the student pleased. But, most of all, there was that delightful concept, the freedom from supervision. Somehow or other, those 10,000 American scholars who went to study in German universities, before the War of the States, and soon afterward, they brought back the concept of freedom for the professor, but they did not bring back the freedom for the student.

But our ingenious, inventive American students, after the First World War, either invented themselves or discovered by some kind of transmission that fourth concept of freedom, the freedom to be free from supervision, and for many years the ideal heaven for many students was a dean-less campus -- freedom from supervision.

As you remember, if you read the NSA and other literature, this is part of the controversy: the freedom to hear or listen to speakers of their own choice, the freedom to editorialize, particularly politically, the freedom to express points of view, and, as I said, the freedom from supervision.

This is about as far as one can delineate the American scene today. What we do need desperately is some definitive statement of what the nature of the concept of freedom for students is currently. What are the policies, what are the practices? And then, having a verified, factual understanding of the current scene, rather than depending upon rumor and other means of communication, perhaps we will be in a position, both as deans of students, and our presidents, and our trustees, and our student editors, and our student government leaders, to begin a sober, sensible, mature practice of enacting desirable freedoms on every campus. And instead of having the kind of fruitless, un-intelligent controversy that has characterized a good deal of American college life, about desired freedoms, by the process of demanding -- as though demanding were an enacting process -- perhaps we can come out with desirable guidelines and principles that will be adaptable to the various special needs of various types of campuses.

It is the hope of our Commission, insofar as we have been able to think it through, that we will proceed

through at least ten steps. The first one we have completed. That is the very difficult task of formulating a foundation request which will convince those who have money that this is worthwhile as an investment. I find that that is not an easy task, for which I have not very much talent. I have specialized all my professional life in spending the taxpayer's money, not in helping to raise it. (Laughter) But finally we have succeeded in finding a sympathetic foundation.

I have not counted the number of reject letters I have received, but it is very large. I do not know why. Someone told me that no one understands the psychology of a foundation executive. But, whatever it is, we have finally received the money -- although I have not yet got the cash on the barrelhead. Being a little Scotch, I do not want to spend it yet.

So we have gone through the foundation request formulation and the solicitation of funds.

Now we have the very interesting and difficult job of spending it intelligently and wisely. So for the rest of the summer I will be engaged, at least, with some technical assistance from consultants, with the difficult job of translating the foundation request into a research design, including data collecting procedures and instruments, and selecting a stratified sample of campuses.

We will have two stratified samples, by type of college and by geographic location, because we want these to be national studies. This is not a research study of those campuses where incidents have taken place. That is another field. Somebody else will have to do that one. This is a study of the practices of a national stratified sample -- stratified, as I say, by type of institution and by geographic location, so that we can come out with a truly national picture, the first time we have ever had anything of this sort. And, as you know, this is not easy to work out, a stratified sample.

There will be two parts to the study. One will be a questionnaire survey, and it is difficult to get a good questionnaire, and easy to get a bad one, of current policies and practices on this stratified sample of several hundred institutions. We will try to questionnaire, with regard to policies and practices, anonymously, the president, the faculty chairman of the committee in charge of student affairs, the editor of the daily, and the president of the student government. Just the other day I made so bold as to think that maybe we might conceivably get some replies from the presidents of the boards of trustees.

Now, it is evident that we are after two things. One is not to take any one person's opinion as to what the

practices, unwritten or written, and the policies are on any campus. We are trying to get verification by different samplings of different campuses.

What we are going to do when we get disparity, I do not know, because you may find on a campus, as you well know, that one person says one thing about the current state of freedom, and another one reports something else. So that is a technical problem we are going to have to face.

The other reason for this action is not only to verify and get consistency or inconsistency, but also to get different perspectives, because obviously there are many, many vector forces that must be resulted before an operating practice and policy is clear and observable, because not any one person makes the final decision as to whether or not Ben Davis comes to a campus, or as to whether or not the editor of the daily has exceeded proper journalistic restraint. Therefore, we must, if we are going to get an adequate picture of the current scene, sample different perspectives.

The second part of the study is to be a more intensive, personal interview study, of these same personalities, or their corresponding functionaries, on a smaller stratified sampling of campuses. In our asking budget, we wanted to survey by questionnaire 800 campuses, and 50 intensively. I am told by my technical consultants that this is just too much, in terms of time limits, so we may have to reduce it.

After we have collected all these data, they will have to be processed on computers, collated, and compressed. And then comes the most difficult problem of all, that of interpretation, because, contrary to some impericists, data do not compute themselves. Even with computers, there is still some function left for the cerebral cortex. (Laughter)

Then the interpretive data will be presented to the full Commission, and to technical consultants for their interpretation, so we can begin to tease out of the data the essential meanings.

Then will come the task of report writing, and those of you who have gone through the delicious torment of writing a thesis know this is the most exquisite self-torture of all.

The reports will then be widely reviewed, both by the members of the Commission and by other consultants, so we can be sure we are getting the proper shade of meaning and valid meaning out of the data.

There maybe collateral studies. In our foundation request we proposed several collateral studies, one of which

may not be necessary now. Since we first conceived of the idea of collateral studies the whole problem of the legalities of the institution's authority over students' expressions of opinions and points of view has been somewhat clarified, and we may therefore have less of a task of pulling together what is the legal authority, both of the student to express, and of the institution to review the mode of expression, but not the content. Well, there are some legalities that may have to be cleared up.

We thought also that this, like other aspects of American culture, has a history. But the history of students' efforts in academic freedom has never been written -- at least I have never found any history. The one definitive history of academic freedom for faculty does have one single chapter on the student's freedom, but it is not by any means definitive, and it is largely Germanic in flavor. So we may wish to employ an able historian of American higher education to pull together at least the outline of the history of the students' efforts to force academic freedom and of the administrators' attempt to suppress it, may I say, because that is a part of history, may I say.

We may also wish to employ a competent philosopher of higher education to bring forth what I would hope would be an enlightenment of: Why academic freedom for students? What does it have to do with higher learning? Because there seems to be a great deal of confusion on this point.

Many critics of American education seem to have the formula, particularly the Admiral: Teach them the facts, and that is all. Well, I do not think it is quite that simple. But perhaps we may have to delineate the philosophic aspects of the whole problem, if we had money enough.

Finally, there will be the presentation of the completed report, and any collateral reports, to the Executive Committee for its action.

We hope that there will be issued by NASPA, as publisher, a series of related reports, some of them technical, for persons who are interested, perhaps ten years from now, in perhaps repeating this study, to identify trends, as Father Pat suggested yesterday, some written very simply for the friends of freedom, and the trustees, and whoever wishes to read simply what this problem is all about, because there is a good deal of confusion about it, as you well know, as well as a good deal of radiation. But, particularly, we are interested in distributing to the presidents of all 1800 or 2000 institutions copies, at least of some of the reports, to lay the foundation in an enlightened acceptance of the fact that there is a problem to be discussed, instead of one to be administered unilaterally, the whole comprehensive nature, and many of the unexplored problems and aspects of this whole thing we loosely call academic freedom of expression.

It is obvious that the Commission has in mind not an academic study in a sterile sense, nor do we have in mind any attempt to standardize institutional practices, but rather an attempt to open up the whole problem of freedom of students' expression, so that the academic method of serious, studious, thoughtful study of the problem will become the *modus operandi*, instead of the demonstration, or the picketing, or the resolving, or some other of the futile methods that have been employed. In other words, we hope to make the academic freedom for students' expression an academic problem in the best sense of the word, so that over the years there will be thoughtful consultation on the campus, among editor, student government leader, president, trustees, faculty, in defining and re-defining what kind of freedom of expression, what manner of expression is appropriate to an institution of higher learning.

I am sure the Commission is grateful for the support we have had from the three Presidents, including this one, and that we will have next year from the Executive Committee, and the very sympathetic support that all of you have given us. Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN GWIN: Thank you, Ed, for a very fine report.

You have heard the report. May I have a motion to accept it.

VICE PRESIDENT YANITELLI: I make the motion.

DEAN WARREN H. SHIRLEY (Florida A and M University): I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: Any discussion of the report?

... Calls for the question ...

CHAIRMAN GWIN: All those in favor of accepting the report please say aye; opposed. It is so moved.

I would like to ask Bob Shaffer now, Chairman of Commission III, if he will report on the activities of his Commission, please.

DEAN ROBERT H. SHAFFER (Chairman, Commission III, Indiana University): Mr. President and Mr. Chairman: The caucus you saw here was asking if we could give this report in time to get you out for lunch. The answer is yes. Our report is short; it has been mimeographed and mailed to you at your institution before you came. Those of you who did not receive copies, I would personally urge you -- somewhat pride of authorship involved, I guess -- to pick them up and memorize them. (Laughter)

Ed made a point there about how these computers did

not interpret themselves. It reminded me of a joke on our campus that is making the rounds. A husband came home, after commuting one night. His eyes were wild and his tie askew. His wife met him at the door: "John what's the matter? What happened today?" He said, "Honey, the electronic computers broke down and I had to think." (Laughter)

Now, our report is of Commission III, on the Development and Training of Student Personnel Administrators. I will move very rapidly on it. By going rapidly, I certainly do not want to give the impression that we think this is an insignificant portion of the administrative job in our field. In fact, it is just the contrary. We feel that a gross inadequacy in the training of student personnel administrators has been the failure to impress upon administrators the importance of the personnel development phase of our staff job. This means -- I am not talking about the individual student, but I am talking about your staff member.

All I can predict as an individual (and I believe the Commission members share my concern) is we will not be able to recruit staff members in the next six, seven years if we cannot hold out to the opportunities for personal growth and development on our staffs. Therefore I feel this Commission (not because I am on it, but because I think the subject matter is important) is one of the most important of the Association, and I hope that you as members will allow yourselves, with one or the other of the activities which the Commission members have rolling, because I think they are going to be important.

The report outlines the Pre-Conference Seminar. I want to pay tribute to Don Marsh, who almost single-handedly took a hold of this project, with great energy and effort, and initiative and vision, and organized it. I know I speak for him. When the evaluation sheets come out, I hope that those of you who participated and those of you who are staff leaders, who have members who participated, will make certain this is evaluated carefully. This did not just happen. It took a lot of work. If it is worth it, this Association can find the manpower to do it. But if it is not worth it, then now is the time to make the answer, rather than have a bunch of people, sincere, eager-beavers maybe, beating their heads against the wall and having the others say "Look at those fool-hardy guys running around."

So much for the Pre-Conference Seminar. Don, I apologize for dismissing this so rapidly, but we thank you for that.

We have an in-service training program going on. So far it has been noted mostly by failure, failure of the membership to even recognize the value of any in-service techniques or research. I am personally excited about the possibility of the exchange of tape recordings or staff discussions of crucial discussions. I would like to hear what

Ed Williamson's staff said about some discussions they had about when a communist wanted to come and give them a talk, for instance. I would like to know what a small school's staff would say about a problem.

I think we are caught, in addition, by failure to utilize these new techniques. We have this sub-committee continuing, I believe, and I hope again some of you will see this as important enough to spend a few hours a year to contribute to this effort of the Commission's work.

Tom Emmet did a tremendous job in representing both our Commission and our Association on inter-association committees devoted to training. This has one substantive aspect in my report, which I will come to in just a moment.

Again, we must not be ignorant of the development, both nationally and governmentally, and with other associations, in the areas that concern us.

Our brochure got out (nothing of my doing, but it was written) and we had trouble getting it printed. Don Marsh got it out, and it is printed, as you heard. Is it any good? Let us have your remarks. Get your reactions in. Do not wait until we write it again and find disagreement of subject and verb, or use of a plural pronoun referring to a singular subject, or something like that. Read it and give us your reaction on it.

We had a specific topic given to us by the Association last year, from the Philadelphia meeting, referring to a paragraph of a report from Commission V, on the behavioral sciences. Using our best case study approach and eliminating prejudice and emotional reading and so forth, essentially this recommendation from Commission V resulted from a study of friends of ours, made by us on our campuses, which said, "In your opinion, which are some of the weaknesses in the training of the student personnel administrators on your campus?"

A vast majority, a very significant majority of these friends of ours that we nominated said they know nothing about the disciplines. They are not regarded as educative on our faculties and your Association ought to do something about it.

Therefore that Commission recommended that -- and I will read this in just a moment -- this is very short -- NASPA, through its membership, Commissions, and Committees, should seek to acquaint persons interested in careers in student personnel administration with the importance, in terms of employability and effectiveness, of training in an academic discipline and ability to qualify for academic rank and for classroom teaching. Now, this does not say, as maybe you and I got the implication when we first heard it and read it, that this is the only way to go into professional personnel work. It does not even say it is the best way. It is

simply a statement of experts that, "Look, to qualify for this field you'd better have some knowledge in this area," and we had better relay this to young people in our field.

Our Commission met for two hours Sunday afternoon, and we voted to approve this paragraph of Commission V's report, with regard to the desirable training in the academic discipline as one possible emphasis, and the Chairman of Commission III will do what I am doing now, present to the membership the fact that we approved that statement, and, furthermore, we are continuing in an effort to have full elaboration and clarification of it for inclusion in our brochure.

After two hours, we got to the realization that we were having a meeting of the minds on this.

Now, lastly, Mr. Emmet, working with all associations, and hounding offices all over Washington, and so forth, and with his tiny stature, of course, he was able to open a lot of doors, has presented to this Association, through our Commission, which we endorse, the resolution which was sent to you, to your home, to your home institution.

I suppose it is too much to ask you to recall what it is. I believe I will read it quickly. Essentially, as you hear it, remember what it says. It says this: That if there is going to be legislation at the national level in the personnel field, we, NASPA, feel that college personnel should be included.

We are joining in with other professional associations in this feeling, and for the moment -- now, I am trying to explain what you are going to hear and be voting on -- for the moment, we are not even initiating the idea there should be legislation. Essentially we are saying that if there is we want the college personnel field to be included. So here is what it says:

"Whereas the various provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1948 were of great value in the improvement of guidance and counseling personnel and effectiveness in secondary schools, and whereas in the opinion of many leading educators critical shortages of student personnel service workers in higher education will exist in the years just ahead, therefore

"Be It Resolved that NASPA recommend to appropriate government agencies and the Congress, through proper channels, that NASPA would welcome legislation which would extend upward to college and university student personnel service workers an increased number of fellowships, as well as traineeships, demonstration centers and institutes, both short term and regular school year which will provide opportunities for the improvement of the qualifications of individuals engaged in student personnel service fields.

"Be It Further Resolved that because of the existing current shortage of young people entering the field of college and university student personnel service work that NASPA support the proposed Student Work-Study legislation proposed in Title I of the Omnibus Bill as well as the proposal for a National Service Program in principle."

This was mailed to you. It is written out in full, in the mimeographed proposal, the report of the Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of this report. And the adoption of this report will put the Association on record as approving this recommendation, or this endorsement, and would authorize our representatives to transmit it to the proper people.

I move the adoption of this report.

DEAN WILLIAMSON: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: You have heard the motion. It has been seconded. Is there discussion?

... Calls for the question ...

CHAIRMAN GWIN: Question. All those in favor say aye; opposed. It is carried and so moved.

Incidentally, before Jack takes over, I would like to remind those of you who are interested in serving on Commissions to get in touch with Mark Smith, who will be serving as Vice President in Charge of Commissions next year.

... President Clevenger resumed the Chair ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thanks very much, John.

... Conference announcements by President Clevenger ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: I want to advise you that tomorrow morning at nine o'clock we are going to start promptly with this second business session. We hope to have as many of you here as we can, because we may have some lively debate over this proposal on dues structure. This will be first up to bat tomorrow morning at nine o'clock.

Is O. D. here?

Any other announcements before we adjourn for lunch? We are adjourned.

... The Conference recessed at twelve o'clock ...

THIRD GENERAL SESSION

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

The Conference reconvened at one-thirty-five o'clock, Vice President John P. Gwin, Dean of Students, Beloit College, presiding.

CHAIRMAN GWIN: Before we start today I have two announcements for you.

... Conference announcements by Chairman Gwin ...

CHAIRMAN GWIN: We are indeed fortunate today in having Dr. Barry Farrell with us, who is presently serving as Associate Professor of Political Science here at Northwestern, and also Director of Undergraduate Studies in Political Science.

He serves also as Co-Director of the Graduate Program in Comparative Politics. Prior to coming to Northwestern Dr. Farrell taught at Yale University, in Political Science, and also served as an Executive Resident Fellow of Davenport College at Yale.

While he was studying for his doctorate at Harvard University he was a teaching fellow in government, and also a freshman adviser and proctor.

His B.A. was at Queens University in Canada. His Master's and Doctor of Philosophy, from Harvard University.

Professor Farrell has lectured and conducted research projects in Canada, Great Britain, Germany, and other countries in Western Europe. In addition, he has traveled in Eastern Europe behind the Iron Curtain in 1954, 1956, and 1960. He has visited all of the communist countries of Eastern Europe except Albania. In the Soviet Union he has visited cities in European Russia, and also Tashkent and Samarkand and Usbekistan in Soviet Central Asia.

In these research travels he interviewed government officials, professors, university administrators, youth organization members and leaders. He has also met such high communist figures as Khrushchev, Bulganin, Mikoyan, Kozlov, and Nagy.

His most recent trip in Eastern Europe concerns systems of higher education and research in communist countries with particular reference to the roles of students, professors, researchers and university administrators in the political systems.

This, it seems to me, makes him very well qualified to fit in with some of the thinking which has been done in

Commission VIII with regard to our own student activities in these various areas.

I am therefore happy to present to you Dr. Barry Farrell. (Applause)

DR. R. BARRY FARRELL (Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, and Director of Undergraduate Studies, Northwestern University): I should like to discuss student personnel administration and university organization in general in the European communist countries. I should then like to raise a few issues coming from this data which may be of relevance to the American university process.

In recent years my research has been very close to this topic. In 1960 I spent six months in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union studying the organization of higher education and research in their universities and academies of sciences, and interviewing not only members of the academic population -- including faculty, administrators, and students -- but also government and party officials concerned with these activities. In the course of six months I visited all of the Eastern European socialist countries with the exception of Albania and I also spent several weeks in the Soviet Union. This was my third visit to the communist world and thus it has been possible for me to develop some historical perspective on the basis of observations which began in 1954.

I should like today to give you a kind of progress report on some of the data I have collected and some research which is still in progress and to do this with special reference to the area with which you are most involved: student organization and personnel administration.

There are many similarities in the pattern of administrative organization of university activity in these countries. Apart from notable exceptions in Poland, Yugoslavia, and Eastern Germany, the organizational arrangements of the other socialist countries have a great deal in common. In the cases of Poland and Yugoslavia the Stalin era model of university organization has been more sharply altered than elsewhere in Eastern Europe, although when the communist parties took over in these countries originally the tendency was to follow the Soviet pattern. In Eastern Germany several elements of the old German academic tradition have persisted in association with efforts to replicate the Soviet model. Thus the organizational structure to be described will in most of its aspects be common to most of the socialist countries, but I should make the caveat that a more lengthy presentation would also point out important specific differences. I should also like to point out that the survey which follows does not include Albania or China as no direct observation was possible in these countries.

For the discussion of student personnel administration four topics will be examined: (1) general administrative organization of the academic community, (2) recruitment of students, (3) organization within the university, and (4) the character of administrative influences on student life.

1. General Administrative Organization of the Academic Community.

At the top of the academic hierarchy in Eastern European countries is the Ministry of Higher Education. This organization has a general over-all administrative responsibility for curriculum, textbooks, teaching staffs, certification for degrees, organization of various areas of student extra-curricular life, student exchanges abroad, and the implementation of plans in association with the Academy of Sciences for academic research.

Typically also the Ministry of Higher Education has responsibility for the work not only of universities but of higher technical schools and other institutions classed as engaged in higher education. There are exceptions for certain faculties such as Medicine which come under the jurisdiction of other ministries. In several countries there were indications that the administrative load on the Ministry of Higher Education was excessive. Thus there were instances of slow processing of materials, administrative bottlenecks, and obviously overworked officials.

In socialist countries general policy tends to originate with the Communist Party. The Ministry serves as an executor and administrator of policy which originates with the Communist Party. Thus the organization of the Central Committee and its subordinate staffs in the capital of a socialist country in some respects parallels the organization of the government and its respective ministries. In the area in which we are interested there is thus typically a department of the Party headquarters concerned with education and there may be several persons on the Central Committee of the Party who specialize in questions of higher education.

The Communist Party must have two over-all interests in the activities of the Ministry of Higher Education. The first concerns the fulfillment of the plans laid down by the Party for the undertaking of research projects specified in current plans and the training of scientists in scientific areas and in numbers prescribed in Party plans. The second major area of the Party's interest are the ideological and organizational aspects of student life. Now we shall see shortly that these interests of the Communist Party are not fulfilled through the Ministry of Higher Education alone. Particularly the ideological and organizational interests may come under the jurisdiction of the youth organizations and the Party organizations in the universities. Nevertheless,

as the Party is interested in the general fulfillment of its plans and the Ministry of Higher Education is the ministry responsible for the university activities, the Party has a very direct role in guiding the Ministry.

There is, of course, some overlapping of personnel. High officials of the Party concerned with higher education may also serve as senior officials in the Ministry of Higher Education. In many areas the guidance of the Party may not be in the form of a detailed instruction sent from the Party to the Ministry. In informal as well as formal ways the officials of the Ministry become aware of Party policies. These officials may be responsible for the day to day decisions in carrying those policies out. Nor should it be suggested that there is a complete separation of policy and administration, partly for the reason that some Party and Ministry personnel overlap as already mentioned, and partly because there are areas of operation of less interest to the Party and in these areas officials will have wider decision-making discretion.

Of less concern in the field of student affairs but of great importance to professors is the role of the Academy of Sciences in the general organization of the academic community. For the purposes of the present discussion it is only necessary to mention that the Academy of Sciences assumes a role of the importance of a ministry of the government. It is responsible for the planning and organization of all of the scientific resources of the country and for the assignment of research tasks to specific institutions and individuals. Policy guidance for the Academy of Sciences comes of course from the plans drawn up by the Party.

The universities tend to be less research organizations and more teaching organizations than would be typically the case of major universities in the United States. Though research is carried on in the university, the professor will normally find it to his advantage economically and scientifically to work under one of the departments or sections of the Academy of Sciences. Most research funds are controlled by the Academy of Sciences, with the exception of specialized research which may come under specific ministries, such as Agriculture. Some research will be conducted by the universities under arrangements with the Ministry of Higher Education, but most will be conducted under the direct organization of the Academy of Sciences and within its structure. Many of the employees of the Academy of Sciences are not associated with the universities. By the same token, many university professors are not associated with the Academy of Sciences. Those who do have double appointments tend to fare rather better economically. One fares particularly well economically if he is elected as a corresponding or full member of the Academy of Sciences. Then he takes home with him his university salary, an income for being one or other grade

of Academician, and probably a salary coming out of his research work in one of the sections of the Academy of Sciences.

A final element in the over-all general administrative organization of the academic community which should be mentioned is the Communist Party youth organization. Normally there is in each socialist country an organization like the Soviet Komsomol which has a student department. The Party youth organization also embraces membership of younger people in the factories and other areas of activity and thus the student group is typically only one section of the organization. As in the Soviet Union, memberships from eighty to ninety percent of the students are claimed for the Party youth organization. There is also typically another organization called an association or a union of students which tends to look after questions of student welfare such as health insurance, housing, travel and tourism, and physical conditions within the university. Typically this organization tends to be rather less important than the communist youth organization although in Poland the reverse is the case. Since 1956 membership in the Polish Party youth organization -- the ZMS -- has fallen off sharply and the student organization has assumed some of the roles in social affairs and university activities which are performed by the communist youth organization in other socialist countries. The student organization tends to be far less political, of course, than the Party youth organization. In Poland this means that at the present time the student is rather less organized politically than is true in several other socialist countries.

2. Recruitment of Students.

Before we discuss the actual organization within the university it is important to examine the general structure of admission and recruitment. We all know how the office of admissions can, by its selection policies and activities, materially affect the character of the student body in any one of our universities. As countries undertaking a revolution -- a social and class revolution -- this process of recruitment of the future intelligentsia is perhaps even more important to the leaders of socialist countries.

The mechanics of recruitment or admission to the university tend to be in superficial respects similar to our own experience, although there is typically a much greater stress on an oral admissions interview or examination. The student fills out a long questionnaire, submits records of his high school work, and then appears before a committee who judge his capability. The latter step is not invariable, but it seems to be quite common. Since Eastern Europe societies are undertaking a revolution, a revolution which fosters the peasant and the proletariat, they have concluded that the intelligentsia of their society should so far as

possible have origins among the industrial proletariat and the agricultural peasantry. This means that special advantages are given in recruitment to students with such origins. There are frequent appeals in the press and at Party gatherings to increase the proportion of the total student population with worker and peasant origins. The targets would place the majority of students in these categories. One suspects that by elastic definition of the term "worker" and the term "peasant" these quotas have been reached better on paper than in reality. A policy of wholesale discrimination such as was followed in the Stalin era produced students with the correct peasant or proletarian genealogy but often with narrow perspectives and capabilities. One suspects that in the relaxation following 1956 a greater representation of the sons and daughters of the old middle classes and of the communist officialdom has occurred.

Nevertheless, the goal is a social and class revolution, a new intelligentsia which supports the Party and is both scientifically and politically contributing to the socialist society. And though the worker-peasant ratio of the total student population may be rather less than some of the Party activists would wish, there is no question that it is enormously higher than it was before the coming of the communist leadership.

The mechanics of recruitment and admission reflect the class goals and the political goals as well as the drive for scientific competence in areas the Party deems important. The first step is the enlargement of the pool of potentially eligible students by substantially increasing the number of students who receive a primary and high school education. Considering the historical academic primitiveness of several of the Eastern European countries, this is a feasible policy. From this enlarged pool of potentially eligible students questionnaires attempt to identify those who possess both academic ability and desirable political qualities. The student applying for university will typically have to receive recommendations from his high school section of the Party youth organization, from his academic authorities in high school, and sometimes from such officials as trade union leaders. He will probably have to provide data on his parents' political backgrounds. This is particularly true in Eastern Germany and those countries which were in association with Hitler in World War II.

When the student comes up for his oral interview, he will face an examining committee made up not only of academic officials of the university but also of representatives of the Party, the youth organization, and possibly the trade unions. They will ask themselves whether this candidate is competent academically and at the same time supportive politically. They will explain this dual interest to you, as one official did to me, that they have no interest in having trained a student so he will be better equipped to undermine

the regime. In the Stalin era it was frequently the case that worker-peasant genealogy, Party youth organization activity, and general political supportiveness were regarded as more important than academic competence. With the enlargement of the pool of eligibles and less dogmatic application of political policy, the tendency now seems to be more in the other direction. Students with what the communists might regard as dubious backgrounds do get admitted to university on the gamble that in the course of their college education they will become more politically supportive.

An example of the extreme to which this political element in recruitment went in the Stalin era was a story I came across in Czechoslovakia. There a woman with two sons had been regularly attending church services and manifesting prominently her religious devotion. When her oldest son applied for admission to the university it was clear from the record that he was one of the strongest candidates academically. He was in fact first in his class at his large high school. Nevertheless he was rejected. The high school principal told the woman that if she did not want the same thing to happen to her younger son she had better discontinue her religious activities.

It might also be pointed out that the son who was rejected was not himself attending church services but it was regarded as important that he was being brought up in an "unscientific" environment. This sort of Stalinist dogmatism undoubtedly resulted in the wastage of talent. It is worth noting that in the Khrushchev era, particularly since the liberalizations following 1956, much effort is being made to make maximum use of available resources of talent, something which obviously increases rather than diminishes the scientific challenge of the communist world.

In recent years it has become common in several of the countries of Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union to recruit students who have spent a few years working in factories or on the farm or undertaking their military service before entering the university. There are also many cases of students who have worked for several years in factories before being admitted to the university. It is claimed that this provides the university with a more mature student, one who has been observed under mature adult conditions, and may possibly serve the communist goal of breaking down the wall between the intelligentsia and the proletariat, giving the intelligentsia a sense of awareness of the broad masses.

One final comment on recruitment. The Communist Party policy in Eastern European countries has been to put a very great emphasis on the recruitment of students for training in the natural sciences and much less for training in the humanities. Education from the beginning of college tends to be heavily vocationally oriented. The great majority

of students in higher education in socialist countries are studying in the sciences and in many instances the pressure seems to be to increase this percentage rather than diminish it.

3. Organization Within the University.

The organization of universities still varies a great deal according to the historical tradition of each. In East Germany one will still find a somewhat decorative officer who will be known as "His Magnificence, the Rector" -- who, by the way, spends most of his time being "His Magnificence." Typically there is a symbolic head of each university and below him a vice-rector or otherwise appropriately titled official who generally has enormous power. This official will represent, very often, the joining of the interest of the Party and the interest of the university leadership. His powers may extend over budget, hiring, promotions, job placement for students, curriculum, and publications. He will also be important in organizing the research activities of the university. This is not to say that this man will make all policy regarding all of these areas but he will probably have a hand in policy and a power of veto which will be of great importance.

The person with the title of "dean" is primarily an academic official and his responsibilities refer most directly to matters of curriculum, standards and promotion of students, and the general organization of the academic activities in the specific area in which the individual is dean. He will be responsible for the carrying out of the directives of the Ministry of Higher Education and the goals of the plans in collaboration with his colleagues. He is more analogous to an academic dean in the United States rather than a dean of students.

In Eastern Europe the professor, particularly the head of the Chair, seems to be rather more important than a professor in the United States. There are far fewer people with the title "professor" and the head of a Chair may be rather more important than a chairman of a department in the American system. Such a person will have associated with him a "cabinet" of scholars and assistants. In accordance with European traditions which are by no means communist, the professor has typically at his control a group of assistants whose careers depend on him and who tend to remain as assistants for rather longer periods than would be the case in the United States. These people will help him in his teaching and research and also perform a variety of administrative duties. For the student, education may be more personalized. He may attach himself to a professor and rely on his support, patronage, advice, and censure. Some of the functions which might be performed by deans of students in the United States are undoubtedly performed by heads of Chairs in Eastern Europe.

We must now examine further the role of the Party organization and the Party youth organization in the university. It is worth noting that a great deal of extra-curricular advice and counsel and even administration of discipline take place through the Party and Party youth organization rather than through an equivalent of the American dean of students. In a typical university in Eastern Europe there are at least three institutional manifestations of the Party. The first is the Party youth organization and its leadership. Membership in this organization in some East European countries is as high as ninety percent of university students. The organization is responsible for helping students in academic activities, for arranging social affairs, for organizing demonstrations like the May Day demonstrations, for helping with job placement, and for several aspects of student discipline.

Since the university section of the Party youth organization is only a part of the total organization the university section also has a responsibility for bringing the students in contact with industrial workers and other segments of the organization. In different countries the organization has different names. For example, in the Soviet Union it is called the Komsomol; in Bulgaria it is called the Dimitrov Komsomol; in Hungary it is the KISZ; in East Germany the Free German Youth.

I have mentioned already but I want to underscore the fact again that in Poland the equivalent organization -- the ZMS -- is much weaker in the universities and the Polish student organization is the principal organization for Polish students. Probably also in Poland a relatively larger percentage of students in universities join the Party than is the case in other Eastern European countries.

Normally membership in the Party itself is open to a very small number of students. Nevertheless, the Party organization has a strong influence in the university. Several of the leading professors are Party members. The heads of the student youth organization and its professional managers are almost invariably Party members. In most universities in Eastern Europe there is a Party secretary who is responsible for coordinating all of the political activities of the university. He works in close association with the university Party committee, which serves as the executive cabinet for the full membership in the university. Each faculty of the university may have a similar Party committee and Party secretary who are in turn responsible to the university Party committee.

In most universities in Eastern Europe there are required courses in Marxism-Leninism and other political subjects which are closely scrutinized by the Party organizations. Finally, the Party, in cooperation with the Party youth organization, jointly have responsibility for organizing student

demonstrations on political occasions, for Party propaganda, for the correct presentation of the political line, for the organization of political "circles" for discussion of political and other issues, and for the correction of political influences which are regarded as undesirable. In collaboration with the Party youth organization the officials of the Party help organize summer activities, make recommendations on scholarships, arrange excursions and vacations, and help in the admission and eventual placement of students.

4. The Character of Administrative Influences on Student Life.

The word "administrative" has a special meaning in communist countries. It tends to imply the application of coercive methods to direct behavior along desired channels. It also tends to imply the application of punishment for undesirable behavior. Thus if an Eastern European communist were to look at the activities of an American dean of students' office he would say that that office was partly responsible for the application of "administrative measures." It may be appropriate, therefore, to examine here the elements of the system of rewards and punishments -- including subtle coercion as well as direct coercion -- to be found in the communist university structure.

Two generalizations are in order at the outset. The communists tend to be rather more permissive in areas of personal conduct than is the case in many American institutions. The university worries less about student social gatherings, party raids, sexual improprieties, and the complaints of distraught parents. A second generalization is that the dean's office is rather less concerned with the planning of a student's curriculum so that he may get what we call a broad, liberal education. In fact undergraduate training tends to be highly professionalized and specialized from freshman year on. As mentioned before, the majority of students study in the natural and physical sciences and almost all look on their training as direct professional preparation. Apart from courses in the Russian language, in Marxist-Leninist philosophy, economics, or politics, the student is required to take very few courses outside of his field of specialization. He plans his courses according to his interests and with the advice of his professor. He does this within the framework of requirements provided for degrees in various subject areas. The examinations at the end of courses tend to be oral examinations and professors devote much of their lives in the late spring conducting oral examinations for each of their students.

The academic and Party establishments are interested in fulfilling their goals, in training top scientists who are politically supportive, and these in numbers more or less according to the quotas established in the scientific plan. It is in the fulfillment of these objectives that the

system of rewards and punishments operates. This should now be examined.

A major administrative influence on student life is the assignment of scholarships, prizes, and awards. Most students are on scholarships. These scholarships are adequate for a frugal existence, an existence which is low by our standards. On the other hand, for meritorious activity there are a good many special scholarships and prizes available, some of which are so large as to more than double the amount of the basic scholarship. This makes it possible for the student to live in obviously much better conditions.

Likewise there are conditions under which the basic scholarship can be reduced for unsatisfactory behavior. In some countries the scholarship is controlled by the university but the Party youth organization can give important advice which is very often listened to. In some other instances the Party youth organization has almost controlling power. Whoever the authority may be, the fact remains that an ultimate sanction of reducing or cancelling the scholarship can bring disastrous hardship to the student. Cancellation may in many instances be tantamount to dismissal from the university. Similarly an increased scholarship can be of greatest aid for the student's living conditions and social activities.

Placement on graduation has already been mentioned. In a planned economy there is probably a closer relationship between the authorities within a university and job placement than there is in a society such as ours. As a consequence, one's activity in the university may have very decisive influence on one's future life. Eligibility for membership in the Party can be greatly influenced by scholastic, political, and social behavior while in the university. Recommendations for membership will naturally be sought in the case of younger candidates from distinguished Party members on university faculties who have known the candidate while he was at university. Thus both the assignment to jobs and the determination of eligibility for Party membership for those interested in membership will be substantially influenced by the university record. The wise student will be anxious to keep his file looking as acceptable as possible.

In some but not all socialist countries assignment to "practice" can involve reward or sanction. "Practice" refers to the policy of having students undertake summer work during their vacations which is supposed to help them gain an awareness of the practical applications of their studies and improve their political perspectives. Not all jobs are equally desirable and less desirable assignments have tended to go to those whose records have been less satisfactory politically or academically.

Another form of influence on student life is the discussion group set up by the Party youth organization.

This form is to be found in some but not all socialist countries and in not all faculties in each university. Membership groups of limited size meet at regular intervals to discuss political and academic topics. These groups also arrange study aids, including assistance of beginning students by more senior ones, or help of weaker students by stronger ones. In this group system students and faculty watch over the actual processes of study and learning. In these groups there may be a discussion of individual members. A member who has exhibited incorrect Party youth organization activities, who has neglected his studies, or who has otherwise created a negative impression may be subject to criticism and discipline by other members of the group. This kind of thing can range from a mild work of criticism to a rather harrowing emotional ordeal.

The assignment to assistantships and general professorial patronage represent further forms of influence over the student. With degrees much more professionally oriented than in American society, a proportionately larger number of students look to the assistance of professors or receive other forms of professorial patronage. Such benefits go to those who in the eyes of the professor best fulfill the ideals of the system as he interprets them. Sometimes the Party youth organization may have a veto or at least an influence in the selection of assistants.

Another form of outside influence on the student's behavior comes in the evaluation of requests to attend summer vacation camps or participate in trips abroad. When a student applies for such benefits he can probably not expect a favorable decision in the event that his record shows unsatisfactory behavior. Regulations for foreign travel permits are much more strict in some socialist countries than others. Where the regulations are most strict the check on a student's political reliability is particularly careful. One of the most prestigious ways to travel at home or abroad is as a member of the delegation with some cultural or exchange purpose. Those selected to be delegates are commonly those most active in political organizations. Thus the student who has pleased the political establishment may have more opportunities for travel within his own country and abroad, and he may have wider opportunities for participation in summer vacation camps.

The final form of administrative influence on the student is of course expulsion from the university or ultimately even police action. In the Stalin era, students like all others in the population did go to jail for unacceptable political behavior. In recent years the tendency has been away from this sort of sanction and more in the direction of developing a system of rewards and punishments of a more subtle sort. The student receives a substantial amount of political training designed to create favorable attitudes and he is strongly encouraged to do his best academic work.

In this line lies reward while he is at university and the possibilities of a bright future after he graduates. Many of these benefits are denied him if he chooses the opposite course. Likewise if he chooses that course he will be admonished along the way and perhaps even dismissed from his studies. Of course there is evidence of opportunism, student contrariety, and nonconformity. The ultimate verdict on the Stalinist methods which relied heavily on coercive action, or the post-Stalinist methods which rely more heavily on other forms of persuasion, will await the judgment of history.

It may now be appropriate to raise some questions for our own system of student personnel administration in light of the comparative experience that I have touched upon in a few of its high points for the European communist world. I must say that I think that we can learn from them that all educational systems have an important problem of maximizing the potentialities of our student and professorial talent. It is difficult to judge whether their system gets more academic quality out of their student potentialities than ours. Superficially one has the impression that their students work harder and this may well be related to the social and economic mobility derived from a university education under the conditions of a developing society and economy.

In a richer society such as ours, in one where education means less in the way of social and economic mobility, it becomes necessary to examine all forms of incentives and institutional forms which may assist us in getting the maximum out of our students. In the competition which exists between the communist world and ourselves each side needs the use of its maximum intellectual resources.

In view of the efforts being made today by the communist systems, it is necessary for us to get the message through to our students that there is for them and for their society an advantage in going full throttle and in achieving their maximum. It may be also important for deans and university faculties to consider whether we might not be able to use the existing structures of student organization to encourage and direct our students into greater academic achievement. The problem is not solved for our society when each year we expel for low grades from our universities substantial numbers of students -- particularly freshmen -- whom we know to have considerable ability but lack self-discipline or motivation or some other quality which enables them to meet our standards. Such talent might be developed by different encouragements and stimuli.

It seems to me that the communist experience with its concern not only for the academic achievement of the student but also for his total political-social development points up another area for our concern. We are not in this country much interested in the political views of our students

but perhaps it would serve our educational system better if more of our faculty concerned themselves with some phases of their undergraduate populations beyond that which takes place in the routine of the lecture room. It is not necessary to develop a totalitarian philosophy to see that something more than a routine awareness of our students' mass existence by our faculties might produce a fuller education of the total person.

I think we can also learn something from the Stalin experience. The highly authoritarian form of academic organization produced a discontented university population which was prepared to lead the upheavals in Poland and Hungary in 1956 and which was disproportionately represented numerically in escapees from Eastern Germany. There developed under Stalin the image of a cold, humorless, dogmatic, inhuman authority "above" "up there" which had very little relationship to one as a student "down here." Individuality was often replaced by opportunism and playing it safe. Bureaucracy "up there" made its rules and told the student he should like them. The communication channels from "up there" and "down here" were all but closed except for a few people. Many of them were student political zealots and opportunists who, having lost touch with "down here" reported incorrect information.

I think one of the most difficult things for those of us who have roles of authority over students to do is to avoid the "up there" arbitrariness when something goes wrong and when administrative measures seem so much easier than patient explanation and mutually trustful discussion. I think the finest tribute I have ever heard paid to a dean -- one of our Northwestern deans -- was by a student who said a month or so ago in introducing him that everyone felt that his door was always open. The communication channel was open.

It is easier to be a Stalin than to have an open door, infinite patience, a willingness to discuss and explain, and a comprehension of the individual personality. But the latter are the attributes of a free society. I think as teachers and administrators we must teach our students how to act and think as members of a free society. Their student experience outside the classroom should be training for their life after graduation in our society.

In this process of training our students for freedom, I would also argue that it is very important for them to have as much experience as possible in making decisions and in self-government. In this respect we should cherish our pluralistic and competitive group organizations, academic organizations, or living unit organizations like sororities and fraternities. Each can serve as training ground for democratic citizenship. I think as university officials we should foster that training ground and widen to the maximum

area of choice open to each student as a leader or follower in his own private group or groups. There are risks here but this training for freedom may be more important with all the worries and crises it can bring in its train than a tidy order based on subservience to "up there."

It is much easier for me to talk in the abstract on such matters than it is for you who must deal with these problems every day, who must draw a prudent balance between freedom and authority. Faculty members are often for freedom in the abstract and then demand the harshest and most authoritarian treatment for specific students guilty of specific offenses affecting them.

On this inconsistency you as deans should fight us, fight us to seek in practice for our students the widest definition of responsible freedom -- freedom for student choice, individual development, and group life. We must encourage our students to do the best that is in them, exalt the power of the moral person over material things, foster choice, ideas, pluralistic group life and group self-government, rationality rather than arbitrariness, open and trustful communication channels, and above all the experience of responsibility and freedom.

Thank you very much. (Prolonged applause)

CHAIRMAN GWIN: Thank you very much, Dr. Farrell, for your presentation. It was most interesting, and I know everyone enjoyed it, although I am sure you probably have left some feelings of ambivalence with us, because I confess that there have been times when I have allowed the thought to cross my mind of beating up a student. (Laughter) There have been times, I must admit, when I thought the five years' practice in a factory was a wonderful idea. (Laughter) We call ourselves a cooperative program instead. (Laughter) And I must admit that the idea of telling the family to jump in the lake is a wonderful one on occasions. (Laughter)

Seriously, we do appreciate your coming, and we hope you will come again. Thank you.

We do have another meeting coming up, but I believe we can stand a short break.

... The Conference recessed at two-fifty o'clock ...

FOURTH GENERAL SESSION

Wednesday, June 26, 1963

The Fourth General Session convened at three-fifteen o'clock, p.m., Vice President-Designate Glen T. Nygreen, Dean of Students, Kent State University, presiding.

CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: I think perhaps it is time to cut short the friendly conversations and to turn our attention to a major presentation of our Conference program.

It is our privilege to have with us as our guest this afternoon Dr. Sterling McMurrin, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Utah, United States Commissioner of Education during 1961-62.

Perhaps the speaker does not always enjoy having his academic pedigree outlined in some detail, yet I think you would like to know that Dr. McMurrin was a graduate of the University of Utah, and a doctorate from the University of Southern California, with honorary degrees from his undergraduate Alma Mater and from four other institutions. He has had a distinguished academic career, involving visiting in graduate fellowships at Columbia, Princeton, Union Theological Seminary, service through the academic ranks, concluding as Academic Vice President at Utah before he assumed his duties in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Now there are many ways to introduce a speaker. I am mindful, in introducing a Professor of Philosophy, that all of us trace our origins in some way, academically, to philosophy, and each new discipline, as it carves out its place in the academic sun, defines itself as the queen of the sciences, and yet somehow philosophy has maintained a lordship over all of us in a most stimulating fashion, sometimes in a most frustrating fashion. I cannot help but comment from the background of a particularistic discipline that it is perhaps characteristic of a philosopher that he would choose as his topic on which to address us today, "Some Large Problems Facing Education."

I think we are honored to have with us Dr. Sterling McMurrin, distinguished educator, professor, and public servant. I give you Dr. McMurrin. (Applause)

DR. STERLING McMURRIN ("Some Large Problems Facing Education"; Department of Philosophy, University of Utah): Dean Nygreen, Ladies and Gentlemen: I would like to assure you that it is a very great honor and certainly a personal privilege and pleasure for me to address you on this occasion. It was very gracious of Dean Roberts and his associates to extend to me this invitation.

I must confess to you that after submitting for the program the title "Some Large Problems Facing Education" I

recalled that Dean Roberts had asked me to direct my remarks specifically to the problem of the federal government and education. I think, however, that this can be done without very much trouble because I suspect that the federal government is the largest problem that is facing education. (Laughter)

We ordinarily think of the federal government and the whole problem of the federal relationships to education in terms of the federal financial support, and this is quite obviously justified. I do want to give some attention to that matter.

I think however, that there are certain aspects of this problem, although having some relation to the question of fiscal support and fiscal policy, nevertheless, are not essentially financial in character. I would like to call to your attention what seems to me to be one or two large issues in that connection.

The thing I have in mind is actually reflected in the growth in size and effectiveness and prestige of your own organization -- something that is taking place throughout the educational world in this country, both in higher education and in lower education, as you well know -- development of organizations that have institutional membership, such as your own, and organizations especially in lower education that have not so much institutional as personal and individual membership.

What I have in mind is that there is an increasing recognition of the fact that education is a national problem, that it is a kind of problem that must in various ways be served through the achievement of what might, for want of better terminology, be referred to as large, national and international perspectives, and its various facets.

I think this poses for us one of the largest issues that education at all levels has to face in the United States. We have to face the problem of the relevance of the purposes and aims and substance of education to the large historic purposes of the nation, the great needs of the nation, and of our society taken as a whole, and to such even larger facets of life as the general character of our culture in its historical development. And all of these large approaches to the problem of education must be in some way nicely related and effectively related to our concern for the individual.

I am inclined to think really that this poses for us one of the most important tasks that we have for the future, and quite certainly one of the most difficult. I would think that it is especially important, and difficult, for those who occupy the positions that you do in the educational life of the nation where, for obvious reasons, your responsibilities are directed primarily to the academic and other kinds of welfare of the individual but it is necessary to recognize that on the one hand the individual cannot be in

any sense abstracted from his society, and still dealt with concretely as an individual person; and on the other hand, the aims and purposes that are proper to education have to do primarily with the individual in a democratic society such as ours, but have to do also, not simply because the individual is a social being (though partly because of that) but independently of that, with these large national and international and cultural purposes.

The very fact that the world is moving so rapidly in the direction in which it is moving, I think, poses the main problems for the future of education. So it is customary for us to raise questions, for instance, having to do with the problem of the federal control of education, and as you well know this question is generally regarded as more acute in the field of elementary and secondary education than it is in higher education, but I think it is a very real and very important question also in higher education.

Though we customarily approach this issue in terms of such a thing as federal control, I think we have to see it also in terms of what you might refer to as the national purposes and even the problem of national control of education whereby the kinds of controls that are in various ways exerted over educational institutions and their programs, especially by non-governmental agencies, because there is this very large increase in the size and the effectiveness and the total influence and what you might regard as the commitment and vitality of national educational associations of various kinds both higher and lower. These obviously are organizations that have come into being and are moving in the direction of larger effectiveness because there are numerous problems that have to be satisfied, especially the thing that I have already mentioned: achievement of the large perspectives on education and the basis for national non-governmental, as well as governmental action.

Nevertheless, we have to recognize that there are certain dangers in this kind of thing. There are the dangers of the destruction of the diversity in our national life, in our culture, in so far as these are in various ways grounded in the pluralistic character of our educational program. It is to this problem that I did want to bring your attention.

We face inevitably very difficult issues where the satisfaction of certain kinds of needs and purposes in a variety of ways creates new problems. We have this in the case of our largest problem, and the one that is going to become overwhelming in proportions in the future: the relationship of the individual to the totality of his society, and in this connection, his relationship to the state and how we can preserve a genuine and valuable individualism in our society and still do those things which--because of the increasing population, increasing complexity of our social and economic arrangements, the bigness of our institutions and the general character of our historical development among the

nations and the large burden of responsibility internationally -- history has imposed upon us.

Because of all of these things, we do have to recognize that we must achieve a basis for large scale national thought and national action. But how to do that, and at the same time protect the genuine integrity of the individual as a person, is quite certainly the foremost problem that we face for the future as far as our society as a whole is concerned. And how to do it in such a way as to protect not only the individual, and not only protect the individual but to develop a more genuine individualism than we have had in the past, that is, to develop the individual in terms of the freedoms which we hold before us as ideals, and in terms of the rationality of which the human mind is capable both individually and collectively, and do these things in such a way as to not produce a disintegration of the unity and strength of the society but actually contribute to it and then move in the direction of large unity and strength in unified action, and do this in such a way as to not destroy the individualism but actually contribute to it, this is the large task that we face. And I think that it is a task which involves the institutions of education more than anything else.

I do not suggest that it is only an educational problem. Without any question, education must inevitably play the largest role in this sort of thing.

As you know, the problem is usually faced -- and I have already suggested this -- in the country at the present time in connection with elementary and secondary education, under state and local control of schools and opposition to federal control of schools. We do not hear very much about that in the institutions of higher education. We are likely to hear more and be involved even more in this connection than we have in the past.

What I am posing again is simply that the problem is even larger. This is a problem not simply of federal control; it is a problem of what, for want of a better term, I refer to as national control, national control by various kinds of impacts and influences that educational organizations and non-educational organizations and combines of them are capable of exerting.

I would think, in this connection, that one of the great issues that an organization such as your own faces is to make sure that the genuine integrity of the individual institutions that are served is protected. If there is anything that we must do, it is, in a very determined way, to stand up in favor of those forces in our society which are productive of, and protective of the pluralistic foundations of our culture. And the thing which is in the long run, I think without any question, most important in this connection is the pluralistic character of education. This depends

in a very large way, I would think, upon the kind of independence that our public and private institutions of higher education now enjoy and, in principle, the kind of controls that our elementary and secondary institutions now enjoy.

There are not very many people, though there are some, in our society who are positive advocates of moving away from this kind of independence, this kind of pluralism in the educational establishment. I have personally met very few. I have encountered one or two who have argued for the other position with, I think, considerable skill, usually have done so by pointing out some of the shortcomings and positive evils that are to be found in some instances of the diversity and local control of education. There are shortcomings there. It is quite obvious, especially when we are under the necessity as we are at the present time of achieving large national ends even in the interests of security, to say nothing of a future development on a high plane of our culture.

It is an easy thing to argue in terms of the negative things that are found in, let us say, the local control of schools by a local school board. One time in the state of Illinois they had something in the neighborhood of 17,000 independent school districts. That was as late as during the 1940s. Sixteen or seventeen thousand independent school boards capable of determining the policies of the state. There is one state in the middle west that still has approximately 3,000 independent school boards. Even with all of the elimination of this kind of thing that has been going on in the last quarter of a century, there is still something like 36,000 independent school districts in the public schools of the United States, to say nothing of large numbers of the different kinds of private schools and parochial schools, and to say nothing of the independence of the institutions of higher education.

It is quite obvious that the nation cannot conceive of achieving any large success in its educational programs in the interests of national ends -- and I would think even in the interests of individuals -- simply by adding up 36,000 or 37,000 individual educational programs. And of course this thing is not being done.

Just as your own organization has been increasing in its strength and its national influence, I am sure that you are aware that the National School Boards Association has been doing the same thing. As a matter of fact, it has headquarters here in Evanston, Illinois.

I think personally that it is a good thing that the National School Boards Association is increasing in its strength. It is a good thing that the American Council on Education, which is the leading organization representative of higher education in the country, is increasing in its effectiveness and strength. It is a good thing, as long as in

some way or another the achievement of this kind of unity and action through this kind of unity preserves the genuine independence and autonomy and integrity of the institutions of higher education, and as long as it preserves a very large measure of local control of the public schools.

My own impression, frankly, is that though people throughout the nation in overwhelming majority are in favor of the local control of schools, you very rarely encounter good arguments in favor of the local control of schools. They all too frequently use bad arguments in favor of this sort of thing.

I have heard people argue very seriously in favor of keeping an independent school district that has a high school that is not able to graduate over an average of one person per year, on the ground that if the independence of this school district is destroyed the high school will be transferred to some other community and they will lose their basketball team. They have just enough people to have a basketball team around the place. That is hardly a good argument for maintaining a high school, in close proximity to other high schools, that is unable to have a scientific laboratory, or is unable to have any professionally trained and educated counseling for the students.

We hear the most outlandish arguments at times for local control, and an almost total neglect of what would seem to me, at any rate, should be the most important factor in the whole picture: this thing that I have already referred to, the fact that the very character of our democratic institutions and the quality of life, and the spirit of our society seems to be grounded in the pluralistic structure of our culture and the pluralistic structure of our culture in which there is competition of ideas, competition of attitudes and ways of thinking, ways of doing things, and so on. The pluralistic structure of the culture is a product of, in very considerable measure, and quite certainly is guaranteed by the pluralistic structure of the educational establishment.

It seems to me that this is the reason that we do not want to move in the direction of either a federal governmental control of education, or anything that might be thought of as a national, non-governmental type of control. That is, we do not want to move in the direction of a monolithic structuring of the educational establishment and the educational program.

Occasionally, as I say, you will find persons arguing quite effectively against this and pointing out that there are other democratic nations that do have highly centralized educational control. This is quite true. In most instances those nations are comparatively small geographically and in some instances they are small in terms of total population. But even that, it seems to me, is not the main factor. The main factor has (to a considerable extent) to

do with the historical development of the living institutions of a society and the ways in which the people behave.

This matter of institutions such as educational institutions, and how you go about dealing with them, certainly is not a matter of logic or a matter of mechanics. You do not prove anything by showing that you are being inconsistent in the way in which you go about the thing, because the development of human institutions in a society has nothing whatsoever to do with consistency, has nothing whatsoever to do with what we would ordinarily regard as mechanics, and nothing to do with logic.

When we raise the question of whether or not it would be a good thing for this country to have a strong centralized control of education because this is the case in Great Britain, and Great Britain is a democratic society with a fine educational establishment, and so on, it seems to me that this has nothing to do with the point. The historical development of the institutions of Great Britain are for all kinds of reasons that have nothing to do with reason or logic. There are all kinds of causes that have nothing to do with reason or logic, quite different from the historical development of our own.

Therefore, it seems to me, we face the very real obligation in the field of education to make sure that the integrity of a large measure of independence and autonomy of our institutions is protected, and in the instance of public education in the schools, that there is not an invasion of the legal and traditional prerogatives of the states by the federal government.

The Commissioner of Education of the state of Florida, Mr. Bailey, sometime ago wrote what I thought was a very impressive article having to do with the problem of the relationship of local school districts and the authority of school boards to the states. The article, as I recall, was entitled "The Myth of Local Control."

It is quite true that this is to some extent a kind of myth when you think in terms of the local school districts in the states because under what you might call the negative provisions of the constitution, the problem of education is relegated to the states, and the authority to control education is relegated to the states simply because it is not assigned to the Congress, and it rests with the state legislatures, unless in some states there are constitutions which provide for some other arrangement, so that the authority of local school boards is all derived from the states. The real responsibility and the real authority for the public schools resides in the states, and not in these local school boards.

It is a good thing to get rid of many of these school boards, but the question is how far you push that.

How far you push that becomes both a problem of practice and a problem of principle. The nation has been moving in a good direction.

The problem I am raising is not so much a question of the relationship of these local boards of education to the states, but rather more the relationship of the states to the federal government. I would like to say very frankly that though I think this is a tremendously important problem and one which deserves the active consideration of all educational groups that may come up against it, and of all genuinely public spirited citizens, that there is no great danger of our moving in the direction of federal control of education.

The reason why there is no great danger -- I do not say that there is no danger, but there is no great danger of it -- is that the nation is so solidly opposed to it, and it has been shown through experience now that the federal government's involvement with education -- actually since before the signing of the constitution and to a very large measure since the first World War and, as you know, very extensively since the second World War -- the history of the federal government's involvement with education is a history of very careful measures being taken against the possibilities of unwarranted federal control.

I think it is the kind of problem that we need to give attention to, we need to be concerned about it, but it is a most unfortunate thing that so many people have made of it a kind of political issue to the extent of describing the agencies of the federal government that have some relevance toward the educational program of the nation and educational institutions as great ogres that are in some way or another lying in wait to simply pounce upon the educational establishment and take it over.

The kinds of things that from time to time come from individual members of the U. S. Congress in this connection are, I think, morally shocking, that people would stoop so low as to convey the kinds of half-truths and distortions, and outright lies, as some members of the Congress do with reference to this problem of federal control of education.

I want to insist, I think it is a tremendously important issue for everyone to be concerned about, but to suppose that some of these myths that emanate from Washington with regard to the interests and the efforts especially on the part of people in the administration to get control of the educational institutions of the nation, to suppose that these myths have any substance to them is, I think, the height of naivete. As I say, it is a morally shocking thing to discover that the American people will actually elect to the United States Congress persons of such caliber as we occasionally find there, who use matters of this kind that are of fundamental importance to the well being of the

nation, for cheap, political purposes. I am not referring to those who go at the problem in an honest fashion, and I am not suggesting for a moment that there are not the very sincerest of arguments against such things as federal aid to education. But those who are sincere in this thing do not manufacture their myths. They simply face the fact that there are always dangers of control where the source of the money lies.

What is necessary, and what has actually taken place in this country -- and I think we have quite clearly shown in the last few years, especially since the second war, that it can be done successfully in spite of all of the problems that come up, and I want to call attention to some of them in a moment -- what we have actually shown is that it is possible to set up safeguards against federal control of education and still have a large measure of financial funding of educational programs from federal sources.

Now the problem of the amount of money, in itself, is a very real one. Actually at the present time the federal government is investing something in the neighborhood of four billion dollars a year in education. As you read some of the things said by those who are opposed to the federal aid to education, you often get the idea that it has never been tried.

Investing about four billion dollars in education each year, if any of you are interested in taking a look at the most detailed report of this, I call your attention to the fact that it is published by the U. S. Congress, and it is done by the Library of Congress, and it is referred to as the Quattlebaum report. Mr. Quattlebaum is the gentleman who spends his time, and the time of his staff, trying to figure out what the federal government actually does invest in education. It is a very difficult thing to do because there are at the present time about 254 educational programs that are being financially funded by the government and this money is being administered through fifty different agencies, some of which are departments of the administration and others independent agencies.

Ten or fifteen of these agencies, of course, spend the great bulk of the money. Actually most of it is handled by seven of them. The majority of that is handled through the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. They are the largest spenders of federal money for education. Others are the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, and the Atomic Energy Commission, and when you include such things as the children's lunch program, which looms rather large, you get involved with the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor has a number of educational programs that amount to quite a bit financially.

Of the four billion dollars, something in the

neighborhood of three billion dollars is actually money that finds its way to educational institutions. Approximately one billion of the present four billion is money that is expended for what might be referred to as government educational programs, particularly military education, and such things as in-service education programs for people in the federal civil service, and so on. So it leaves about three billion dollars that is going to educational purposes, actually into the budgets of non-federal educational institutions.

Now the problem of actually what is to be regarded as aid to education and, for that matter, what you would even regard as education in this connection, is a very difficult one and that is why Mr. Quattlebaum and his staff in the Library of Congress have much trouble in finding out what the total is. The question as to when do you regard a piece of scientific research as an investment that should come under the heading of education, and then when you raise the question of what do you, and what do you not classify as aid to education, of course it becomes a very real problem.

Very clearly you have aid to education in the case of money that is provided for student loans under the NDEA, but is it aid to education when the National Institute of Health provides money for cancer research in medical schools? Obviously when the Institute of Health provides money that goes to the payment of faculty salaries in medical schools this would seem to be aid to education. But what about the research? Well, the research is usually classified under education, but not necessarily "aid." So you actually cannot get a satisfactory breakdown of what could be regarded as federal aid to education. You simply get this round number, in the neighborhood of three billion dollars a year which goes to educational institutions.

At the present time in the field of higher education the total of federal money is running somewhere around 17 to 20 percent of the total budgets of all of the approximately 2,000 institutions of higher education in the country.

Of course, much of this money is concentrated in a comparatively few schools. The 2,000 figure includes many institutions that are hardly capable of carrying on important scientific research, which immediately would make a difference in their involvement with federal money. Of those that are involved, some of them, as you well know, are involved very heavily, such as Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the University of California, University of Chicago, to take three examples of institutions that actually have under their jurisdiction and include in their general budgets large and very expensive scientific research operations that might be actually classified as separate institutions, that is, operations that are handled by the universities for the federal government. But this actually brings the federal part of the budget up very, very high, up as high, for instance, as eighty percent of the total budget.

I am occasionally in a discussion with colleagues on problems of this kind, and one of my colleagues, who has very close connections with Stanford University, made a point with me sometime ago that he certainly did not want to see Stanford University getting involved with any federal money. This is something they did not want at Stanford. I thought I would just check up and see how much they had, and it is something in the neighborhood, as I recall, of thirty-three percent of Stanford's total budget that is government money.

At my own university at the present time the federal money accounts for 21 or 22 percent of the total budget of the university, which is a little above the average but, as you know is certainly very commonplace.

You might find it interesting, if you have not already done so, to look at the budgets of your own schools to see how much federal money you are involved with, before you take a very, very strong stand against the institution corrupting itself with any federal financial connections.

Here comes, of course, one of the large problems that we face. This is what you might simply refer to as financial independence and financial integrity of the institution. I think this is a very real problem. Some of the leading universities in this country are so heavily involved with federal money that obviously if the federal money were to be withdrawn a very large part of their total operations would collapse. Though this is true, I do not know that it is particularly important, as a point, for the obvious reason that the federal money is not going to be withdrawn. I think this is entirely clear to all of us. Besides, in some cases the universities might be better off if it were, and they closed down a good part of their operation -- better off from the standpoint of some of the things they are doing. I do not think these involvements with federal money are unmixed blessings.

Now you raise a question as to whether it is a good thing or a bad thing. There are a number of factors to take into consideration. I call to your attention the fact that in the last two or three years a great deal has been done to carefully examine the problem of the impact of the federal government through activities of the type now that we are concerned with on higher education. There are several studies that are now available and will be available shortly. You can really get a reliable picture. It is unfortunate that the same kind of a picture cannot be obtained by the federal impact on lower education, which is of a somewhat different character, as you know, and has never been properly studied and assessed.

You have two or three very good books that have been published recently on this subject. I call to your attention three studies that I think might interest you, if you are not

already acquainted with them. The United States Office of Education has financed two of these. One of them, which is now published, was done under federal financing by the Brookings Institution in Washington. It is done entirely without any kind of federal influence. It is simply a matter of contracting with the Brookings Institution, a private organization of impeccable character, as you know, to take a very good, serious look at what the impact of the federal government has been on American colleges and universities.

This was done under the leadership of a gentleman by the name of Harold Orlans, and Mr. Orlans' report has been published in a sizable book. I really would recommend that you take a look at it. If you do not already have it, you could write to the Brookings Institute in Washington and ask for the Orlans report on higher education and the federal government, and you will get it. I do not recall the exact title.

The study there was made of a number of representative institutions. It is not a matter of dealing in loose generalizations, but is very close involvement with the institutions in trying to get at the character of the problem by an analysis of the financial structure of the institutions, the impact of their finances on their programs, and the opinions of people highly qualified to express views on the subject. I think, an excellent piece of work.

The other work was financed by the Office of Education and should be in print shortly, though a small introductory summary version has been in print for several months. It was done also outside of the federal government by a committee convened at the Office of Education headed up by Professor Kenneth Little of the University of Wisconsin, a person of very unusual capabilities in this thing, with several high level university administrators on the committee. Although it was done by a government appointed committee and is being published by the U. S. Printing Office, the report is nevertheless done entirely by people outside the employ of the federal government. If you are interested, this can be gotten by using the name of Kenneth Little, and writing to the U. S. Office of Education in Washington, D. C. Though the full report has not yet come out in print, it is completed and is in process of publication, and there is a smaller version of the report which is a very useful thing because it summarizes the general findings. It is a very useful thing which you can readily obtain.

The other major study that I would like to mention to you, as far as I know is not yet in print in its final form. I could be wrong because I believe it was wound up sometime ago, but I do not believe that it is yet in print. This is a study that was conducted privately, with no connection with federal funds, carried on by a committee that has a very competent staff, headed by President Pusey of

Harvard, and the whole operation financed by the Carnegie Foundation.

If you are interested in that, I suggest that perhaps the best way to get a copy when it is available is simply to write directly to President Pusey of Harvard, asking for copies of his committee report on Higher Education and the Federal Government.

But here you have a study of a number of leading institutions and representative institutions which is very thorough, and two of the institutional studies have already been published.

I believe that the other institutional studies are not planned for publication, but the two that are in print are extremely valuable. One of them is a large volume, published by the Princeton University Press. This is the institutional study that Princeton made of itself under the impact of the federal government. An extremely valuable thing that goes into every aspect of the financial structure of the university in its connections with the federal government. As you would naturally suppose, a very large part of the budget of Princeton is a federal budget. It makes it an excellent case study.

The other is the study made of itself by Harvard University which is an unusually useful thing because it is comparatively small and a great deal of valuable material is packed between the covers. I would strongly urge those of you who are interested in this problem to obtain the Harvard piece for its usefulness, and the Princeton piece for its detailed thoroughness.

These studies are, I am sure, about as good as you could possibly hope for on this problem. I really do not know how we could hope to get at the present time a better look at the impact of the federal government on American colleges and universities. I will say that, generally speaking, the verdict (which is a verdict that has been arrived at critically and analytically) is that though all kinds of problems are to be found in this relationship of the institutions with the government -- and these problems in many instances are very serious and must receive very serious action and thought in the years ahead -- nevertheless, the relationship from the standpoint of the institutions from the standpoint of their educational programs has been overwhelmingly good. Not that it has been 100 percent good.

In order to produce some things that are worth producing, you produce some things that are bad. But the relationship has been good; there has not been a disposition on the part of the federal agencies that administer the federal money to control it -- they do not want to control the educational institutions or programs themselves.

It shows up very clearly, for instance, in the Princeton and Harvard reports, that the present state of our knowledge, particularly scientific knowledge, and the present state of our technology, and the present state of the development of talent in science and technology could not possibly have been what they are now if it had not been for the federal support which these educational activities have received.

It would seem to me to be quite obvious that this is the case but at least here you have a very considered study in these instances of the problem when they come up with these affirmative replies.

But these are not the easygoing kinds of statements about federal aid to education that we customarily run into in connection with the political propagandizing for federal aid. These are very carefully considered statements of the pros and cons of the problem, and there is very little that has not been turned up with regard to the numerous facets of the relationship in these studies.

The problem of the institutional financial integrity is, of course, a very important one. But if you shift from that to the whole picture I think there certainly are two very large areas that deserve attention.

One of these has to do with the matter of personnel. I am sure all of you people are as conscious as any could be of some of the issues that develop in a college or university, especially in a university that is involved in any measure of scientific research on the matter of faculty personnel.

To put the thing in its worst form, I think we will have to face the fact that there are now in the universities, taking the nation as a whole, considerable numbers of people who do not have very much interest in being in a university other than to gain the advantage of its facilities and the prestige and some of the security that goes with being on a university faculty, but who have no particular interest in the intellectual life of the university or in the educational life of the university, but regard themselves essentially as employees of the federal government, because this is where their money comes from, or sometimes from private foundations.

I think this poses some very real problems. It poses problems when you raise the question of promotion, or raise the question of tenure, or the question of academic titles which university people are frequently somewhat jealous about, and problems having to do with faculty representation, in voting, and so on.

I think one of the large personnel issues that we must face in the future in the colleges and universities -- and I say especially in the universities -- is this question of what should be the status of people whose primary concern

and primary work and primary interest has to do with working at federally sponsored and federally financed research, and where the program of the university is of secondary consideration, if it is of any interest to them at all.

I do not mean to suggest that all people who hold contracts under the fundings of the federal government fall into this category. Certainly large numbers do not. I simply mean to say that there are very real problems developing with us in this connection.

Now as to the others, I think one of the things that we have suffered from, and probably are beginning to recover from, is this strange notion that some prestige and intellectual and academic, and even social status, attaches to a man's being able to get hold of some money, especially if it is money from outside of the institution. Money outside the institution seems to convey a kind of prestige that money inside the institution does not have. Very often money that is gotten from the federal government, presumably, conveys a bit more prestige than money that comes from the state government.

This is a very, very strange thing because as a matter of fact, you know, much federal government money has been spent on very trivial things, and much of the time that many of our faculty people have devoted to research, or what they thought was research, ought to have been devoted to something else.

You certainly have this large problem which has to do not only with our personnel difficulties in this connection, but also the very character of the educational program, the very large problem of the relationship of research to teaching.

I personally am of the opinion that in a university a man should be involved in some kind of research. I am not of the opinion that the research side of the university is any more important than the teaching side, but ever since the war it has been considered by large numbers of faculty people as being of more importance. In some way or another, I think we ought to overcome this attitude. As I say, I believe we are overcoming it. It certainly is not the case that research that is funded by money is necessarily any more important than research that does not involve any money at all.

This is one of the problems, as you well know, that we face in the university: These people who do not have some kind of money coming in that the financial office has to look after and see that they eat regularly, are very often not regarded as being involved in anything particularly important. They may be involved in things of far greater importance than some who are actually in funded research.

You take the case of educational research, which

is funded to the tune of eleven million dollars a year now from the Office of Education, and this is something that deserves to be increased and will be increased, because this is a miserably small amount of research to be done on a multi-billion dollar investment such as the educational establishments represent. There is not a self-respecting industry or business in the nation of two or three million dollar size that would be willing to invest such a small portion of its income or of its capital in research and development as we invest in education.

Nevertheless, this is something that has to be recognized as being in its beginnings, and in its beginnings it has made many, many mistakes. A good deal of educational research has been very important, and a good deal of it has been trivial.

Among the trivial things done very often, we are just finding out some things that we already knew before we undertook to find them out. This is not to condemn anyone. People in educational research -- and I am well aware that some of the leaders in educational research are in this room -- have had the problem of developing talent and developing a capacity in the profession for recognizing problems and defining the problems, and so on. It is in its beginnings.

The point I am interested in making is that this is one of the large impacts that the federal government has had on the life of the college and university, the feeling that some way or another there is a kind of prestige and importance and value that attaches to funded research. What I am getting at is not the value of research, but the prestige of having research that costs money. At the present time I am involved with a large foundation and one of the nation's largest business and industrial enterprises that are interested in funding research in a philosophical problem, a problem that I think is tremendously important: That is the impact of automation upon the value structure of our culture and the implications of this impact upon the educational institutions for the future.

They have an interest in seeing that this is done and apparently in providing funds for it in the field of philosophy, where it seems this kind of research should center, but cannot seem to find anybody who is interested in funded research. This is not because they are not interested in doing research and in extending knowledge, but they do not particularly like the idea of having to hire a bunch of book-keepers, assistants, and so on. This is not the way they operate.

I think that there is a kind of lesson in this for our approach to the whole problem in the university: that we cannot construct some false values and get some distorted conceptions of what is or is not important in the intellectual

life of an institution, by moving as rapidly as we did in this direction after the war.

If you turn to the educational problem itself, of course, there are some very large issues. You have the question of undergraduate versus graduate education in a university.

There is every evidence that shows up in the reports that I have mentioned -- and I am sure all of you who come from universities with graduate schools recognize this more or less in your own institutions -- evidence that the large amount of federal money that has been poured into the universities in connection with research programs of one kind and another quite certainly has produced problems in the matter of the emphasis upon graduate education as over against undergraduate education.

This is recognized, I think, broadly across the country. I would think that people who occupy your positions where you are dealing primarily -- not exclusively, but primarily -- with undergraduate rather than graduate students I presume would be very much concerned about the effect of this impact, very much concerned about the question of whether undergraduate education is suffering in your institutions and in the nation. I think personally that it is, and it is one of the prices that we are paying for this large, expensive funding of the scientific research.

I trust that you realize that I do not have the slightest interest in using this kind of negative effect as an argument that we should not be funding this kind of research. On the contrary, I think probably we ought to be doing it more extensively, but that we should extend it into other areas that so far have been rather severely neglected.

The task here is not to say that science and technology are overwhelming the institutions, but to see to it that they do not, or that the graduate schools are just pushing undergraduate education out of the picture and therefore we have to stop this sort of thing. We have to set up counter-forces in some way or another that will guarantee the quality and the integrity of the undergraduate program.

So you have the same problem when you raise this question, which I presume is the most important of all of the questions in relation with the federal impact on higher education, on the distortion of the curriculum, by producing the kinds of imbalances that a large emphasis upon science and technology have in recent years been responsible for.

Here again, I do not think that our problem is to try to cut back the developments in science and technology. When a person says that, you sometimes get the reaction that after all there is not enough talent to go around. As you

very well know, the medical schools complain these days because they are not getting their share of talent. By not getting their share of talent, what they mean is that they used to be able to get almost anybody they wanted, and now physics, chemistry and engineering of various kinds are doing better, and so medicine is not able to dominate the field the way it used to.

Well, our problem really is not a shortage of talent. Our problem -- and this is true all through the structure of our society -- is our failure to recognize talent and to cultivate it, and the failure to develop techniques for preserving it, rather than turning it out into the streets. This, I would think, is one of the largest problems that the nation now has.

It does not do any good for us to develop the attitude that we ought to cut back in certain areas, such as science and technology, because too much talent is going there. We have all the talent we need if we would just get around and use it.

This calls for some very serious reforms in education, of course, reforms that strike especially at secondary education and vocational education and perhaps to a lesser, but certainly a very prominent, degree in elementary education and also higher education. That is, we have wasted our talent with quite remarkable, unbelievable prodigality and certainly there is no justification for it and no real need for it. We simply do not function in our society in the manner that we know how to function.

I recall the story of a farmer's son who had gone to the agricultural college and after he had been there one semester he came home and was telling his father how to farm, introducing him to the latest techniques of contour plowing and the use of insecticides, and the new chemical fertilizers, and so on.

Finally his father stopped him and said, "There is no need of you saying any more, because I am only half as good a farmer as I know how to be now."

I think this is the situation with us in our society, as a whole, and certainly in education. I think it is quite true that we do need to invest a larger proportion of our intellectual and financial resources in educational research and development, but our schools are only half as good as we know how to have them now. Our colleges and universities are not nearly half as good as we know how to make them, and there is a possibility with us of doing far more to identify and preserve and cultivate, rather than waste the talent that is needed.

Quite certainly one of the great problems that is before us in the educational program shows up especially in

the colleges and especially in the universities, but I think also, and in the future it will be increasingly true, of elementary schools and secondary schools -- also in those institutions; It is the problem of the almost complete dominance, in some instances, of science and technology over the whole intellectual life of the institution.

One of our great problems -- and there is no need for me to labor this. I mention it largely because, although I think it is commonplace, I think it is the kind of thing that deserves to be kept always in the picture of this kind of discussion -- is that there is nothing that we need more at the present time than more of what you might call humane knowledge that is available to us in the cultivation of the social sciences and those disciplines that relate intimately and importantly to them, knowing that we need more than the kind of wisdom that is to be achieved, certainly, to a considerable measure from the cultivation of the humanities, and the kind of sharpening and cultivation of our sensitivities, of an esthetic and spiritual nature that one finds in connection with the fine arts.

One of the strange things about our culture -- yet one of those things that we are so accustomed to that we have grown calloused -- is our failure to recognize the very basic importance of the arts in our culture and in the life of the individual. The arts, taken as justification of the emotional life of the individual and of society and its various configurations, are of tremendous importance. Yet, as you well know, if we take a look at the secondary schools and elementary schools across the nation, generally speaking, something that is worthwhile in the arts is made available only if everything else can be accounted for first.

The arts, I presume, are rarely if ever referred to -- to use the language which I think is employed in that connection -- the courses in art and music are never referred to as solids. They are sort of electives, or some sort of fringe benefits or frills on the academic program.

This is a very, very bad thing. I think it is bad from the standpoint of the quality of life of the individual. Quite certainly it is a very serious thing from the standpoint of the total character of our culture, and also, it would seem to me, the strength of our society. I have the impression that the Russians are far more sensitive to this problem than we are, that they are much more aware than we are that a controlled art contributes importantly to the strength and integrity of a controlled society and the national strength of a controlled society. We are aware that free art contributes importantly to the quality of a free society, and the strength of a free society. And I mean by that, not strength in the sense of strength of the culture simply, but also it gives them strength in terms of what you might call in terms of the issue of survival of the nation.

One of the great shortcomings of the United States Congress in matters having to do with education -- I am thinking in terms of simply the majority and not in terms of all, surely -- is the failure to recognize that if it is a good thing to give federal support to education (for instance, the Congress decided that in the National Defense Education Act) in the interests of national strength for survival, it is a very important thing to give that strength through the whole structure of education, because education has to do with the total structure of the life of the individual and the life of society.

For instance, in the case of a federally supported fellowship, an NDEA fellowship, it has been an exceedingly difficult thing to keep the basis of those fellowships as liberal as it is. Yet there are some areas that have been cut out on the ground that this is not what the Congress had in mind when they passed the bill. I am very sure that they did not have it in mind. I am very sure that they did not have some of the areas in mind that are included, because what they had in mind primarily was language, science and technology. It was through considerable effort -- and one of the persons that deserves much credit in this connection is Dean Peter Elder of Harvard. He was the first one to administer the NDEA fellowships -- that the broadest possible base was given to the interpretation of the congressional mandate. Many members of Congress have been complaining about this ever since, and one of the committees has forced some retraction in that base.

The point I am getting at is that this is one of the things that really constitutes a major problem for the educational institutions as they face the future of what I believe is obviously going to be a larger and not a lesser involvement with the federal government: that is, the problem of the protection of what, for want of a better term, I simply refer to as the integrity of the educational program.

If there is anything that is important as a responsibility of persons in the educational profession, it is to recognize that it is the responsibility of educators to determine what should be the substance of education.

I think it is a responsibility of the public as a whole to come to grips with the question of the purposes of education in terms of the individual, the nation, the society and the culture.

When you raise the question of what it is that has to be done in order to fulfill those large purposes -- the purposes that have to do with the creation of a love of knowledge, of rationality, of freedom, and so on -- this is one of what you might call special provinces of the educational profession.

I think it is one of the large tasks that we have

in the colleges and universities. This is true of the secondary and elementary schools as well. The large task that we have as teachers and administrators is to make sure that various kinds of forces and pressures from outside the educational institutions themselves, whether they are governmental or non-governmental, whether they are from individuals or from institutions or from pressure groups of various kinds of self-interest groups, do not overcome us, but to make sure that we stand up and stand up very courageously when the time comes to protect the character of the educational program.

In a sense, this is the same kind of a thing, I think, as the standing up for the value of intellectual freedom and the value of academic freedom, and to stand up for the integrity of the educational program. There is no group that is capable of passing judgment on what the educational program should be, with more wisdom, more experience and more knowledge, or that more fully carries the burden of this responsibility, than the educators themselves.

Here I think is the largest of the problems that we face with the federal government. The big problem is not to be got at in terms of, as I said earlier, the myth that the federal government is waiting to pounce (in some way) on the institutions and take them over.

There are all kinds of little problems that add up to something big in the various kinds of issues that come up in connection with auditing, in connection with reports, haggling over overhead for the universities and the colleges under contracts, and so on, and I do not mean for a moment to ignore them. These things can be very disturbing, they can be irritating, they can be onerous, but in character they are not essentially different from the same kinds of problems that department heads have with deans, and deans have with presidents, and presidents have with boards of regents, and that we all have with the business offices of the university. They are problems that fall into this category.

They do not, whatever magnitude they reach -- and I do not mean to suggest that there are not people who represent Washington bureaus of one kind and another that make serious errors in their dealings with the institutions and with individuals -- these things do not add up to anything that should make us fear the federal government in relationship to federating education on the basis of some sort of totalitarian motive, or a motive to want to create a monolithic structure in education.

As a matter of fact, the people who work in those agencies, for the most part, are just like the rest of us, and I might say here that I hope you people will be willing, as some of you have done in the past, to respond to requests from the federal government to put in time with them, because this is the best thing that can happen. The more

people we can have moving in and out of Washington, going between educational institutions and these federal agencies that deal with education, the better. The more deans of students and professors of various kinds from the universities that are willing to spend six months, a year, two years, in Washington, the better off we are going to be. This thing is going to be with us permanently, and the best way to make sure that we have the kind of personnel in there that the universities want, is for the universities to continue to do what they have been doing, often at very considerable cost, and that is making it possible for their people to serve the government. This is much better than having people who for many years have had no immediate involvement with education occupying all of these important federal positions.

Well, I am sure my time is gone. I would like to close by simply reiterating this point:

Whatever the future may carry for us, as far as the federal connections with the universities and colleges is concerned, whatever it may be, the big responsibility that we have is to make sure that the integrity of our institutions is protected, to make sure that we do have the kind of independence that we now have, not because of the fact that it is simply a good thing for the institutions to have that autonomy and independence -- although that is a pleasant thing and things seem to work very well under it, in spite of a great deal of waste, and at times the duplications that I am sure are not necessary, and so on -- but because so much that is precious in the life of our society and in the quality and character of our culture would seem to depend eventually and ultimately upon the preservation of the pluralistic foundations of the intellectual life of the nation.

Let me tell you again how much I have enjoyed being with you, and my best wishes to all of you. Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN NYGREEN: We have been rarely privileged to have heard from a person whose thoughtfulness and experience combined to give us all insights into our common concerns. Dr. McMurrin, thank you very much for coming and being with us.

Any announcements before we adjourn? Remember the hospitality hour at 4:30 at LeVere Temple. We are adjourned.

... The Conference recessed at four-forty o'clock ...

SECOND BUSINESS SESSION

Thursday, June 27, 1963

The Conference reconvened at nine-five o'clock, President Clevenger presiding.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Gentlemen, because we have only an hour for this business session this morning, and because we do have some important items before us, I am going to call this second business session to order. I am glad to see this many here after a night, on the town last night.

Jim, do you have some announcements to make?

PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE McLEOD: I would rather make them later.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Okay. Carl, do you have some announcements?

SECRETARY-TREASURER KNOX: Yes. O. D. Roberts wanted it understood that the banquet this evening will start sharply at seven o'clock, and the get-together beforehand would start at six. He hopes people will not resent the attempt to curtail activities at seven and move people into the hall.

I would like to say also that rosters of those in attendance are available at the registration desk. The speech by Dr. Sam Gould will be available tomorrow morning at the registration desk.

One last point, and that is that we wind things up tomorrow. You are covered through the noon bell. I know some people are not fully clear as to whether this is included in the package, and it is. So that is about it at the moment.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: In the discussions this morning, Leo and I both would appreciate it if you would give your name and school as you ask to be recognized. I have trouble with these bi-focals and these lights up here. I have difficulty seeing out into this group, so if you will do that, please, in the discussions that are coming. Do you want to get your announcements over with now, Jim?

... Conference announcements ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thanks, Jim. Any other announcements? Any Committee or Commission Chairmen want to announce meetings at this time?

... Announcements of Commission and Committee meetings ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: We now turn to a report from our Executive Committee Subcommittee which has been working all year long on budget and fiscal matters that are before NASPA. This Committee was composed of Mark Smith as Chairman, Carl Knox, and "Hoogie" Hoogesteger. Mark, are you ready to make your report?

DEAN MARK SMITH (Report of Executive Subcommittee on Budget; Denison University): Yes. Nice to be back at the Conference. I told Jack the other day that I am delighted I do not have to work for him all year. I do not even know what day it is.

DEAN TED ZILLMAN (Dean of Men, University of Wisconsin): Sit down, Mark. (Laughter)

DEAN SMITH: I knew Zillman would say something because we mailed our motions out in advance, so he cannot raise that question. (Laughter)

I think all of you have received this advance mailing concerning the recommendation of an increase in dues and action taken to increase the Conference registration fee. In this, one thing I will ask you to accept is that this Subcommittee worked pretty hard, gathered as much information as we could gather, and that the Executive Committee spent a lot of time considering this. I would hope, as I always do at home, that we do not re-do committee business on the floor as a committee of the whole.

As some of you know, what we used as our basis for the decision concerning dues and registration fee was data collected by asking people for five-year projections of needs in terms of minimum and maximum figures. Then, as any good controller -- and Clevenger may be a controller. I never wanted to be one -- we used the minimum figures and ignored the maximum figures.

I think our central considerations in all of this were these: For years I have noticed in this Association, especially when I have been a Commission Chairman, that things are very informal, conveniently, for the Association financially, that you really do not know how much money there is, you really do not know whether or not a Commission Chairman can ask for money for, say, a meeting between Conferences, which is very critical in the work of Committees and Commissions. So what you usually (some of us) have ended up doing is doing what we could afford out of our own budgets at home. I think this has been very unfortunate. I hate to think of the number of good ideas that have been lost because people were not quite sure that they would not have to pay for the activities that the ideas suggested.

Another consideration was the question of the Executive Committee itself, and the problem of getting people on

it, having them come to meetings, adding to their travel as charged to their own budgets, nobody being quite sure whether you should have the guts to ask the Association to pay your fare.

All of this, I think, has meant that when asked to do something in this Association certain persons, and certain persons of real worth, have been reluctant -- not because they were not interested, but because they simply were not sure that they could do the kind of job they wanted to do and charge it to their own institutional budgets.

I do not know about some of you, but I have played a nasty game for years with our controller at home. About five or six years ago I set up a special NASPA budget in our university budget system. Nobody to this day knows where that came from or what it is for, except that I charge things to it, wildly. (Laughter) Trips to Champaign, Milwaukee, Pittsburgh, when the Reds are playing at Pittsburgh. (Laughter)

So it was this confusion which really led us to make a decision as a sub-committee that if this Association is going to do the kinds of things that Mr. Clevenger has brought us to think about, if many of us are going to have the means to get some of the ends that we have in mind, we must have an adequate budget which frees people to think freely and to act freely.

Out of all this came this collection of data. Out of the collection of data came a recommendation. This recommendation was that the institutional membership dues be increased to \$50.00 as of July 1964. It was just about a year and a half away from the time that the committee came up with its final decision. We felt that we wanted it this long before it went into effect so that we could take care of other budget matters, get a clearer picture of proposed budgets and expenditures.

At the same time we felt that the Conference deficit -- that is, the amount of money spent on the Conference coming out of dues income -- should be eliminated, in the sense that the Conference itself should be self-sustaining. We took figures on Conference deficits over the years, projections from O. D., Glen was with us so he knew pretty much what we were talking about, and we took action as an executive sub-committee to raise the Conference registration fee to \$15.00, beginning with the Detroit Conference in 1964.

I do not think you should think that it is unimportant that we put these things off a year and a half from the time we did it.

Mr. President, I would ask, first, that the membership of this Association accept the recommendation from the executive, the unanimous recommendation that the institutional

membership dues be increased to \$50.00 as of July 1, 1964, or as of the fiscal year 1964-65. I so move.

DEAN NOWOTNY: Second the motion.

DEAN JACK MATTHEWS (University of Missouri): Mr. Chairman, following the overwhelming vote of confidence given me yesterday in connection with changing the name of this organization (laughter) I have an amendment I would like to make to this proposition. I would offer this amendment: that the difference between the present \$25.00 per year institutional membership and the proposed \$50.00 a year institutional membership be paid by the individual institutional representative. May I explain this just a moment?

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Yes, Jack.

DEAN MATTHEWS: I have the feeling that very few of us are truly institutional representatives and can really represent our institutions. We all agree that this is certainly a great organization and that it is somewhat different from the organizations of the history professors and the others, where the individual professor pays his individual dues to professional organizations. I recognize differences between the history professor, the language professor and national organizations, and our organization. I believe however that we are not in good faith when we pretend that we are institutional representatives and can speak for our institutions.

I would not argue against Mark's need for the money. I only raise the question as to whether or not we are acting in good faith by saying we are truly institutional representatives.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Thank you, Jack. We have permitted him to speak to his motion before it had a second. Is there a second? Jack, your motion was to have the difference between the present institutional fee of \$25.00 and the proposal to move to \$50.00 paid by the institutional representatives. I believe that is your motion.

DEAN MATTHEWS: Exactly.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Is there a second? I believe your motion dies from lack of a second, Jack. Do we have further discussion?

DEAN JAMES W. DEAN (Virginia Polytechnic Institute): I understand very clearly what Mark is saying, and I am not really sure that I do not wholly agree with it all the way, but as an institutional representative I think I have a right and a privilege to say that I think it might be very difficult for some of us in the state universities -- and I will be cruel here -- to request an increase in budget for a calendar year or a biennium to cover an increase in NASPA

dues. I had a difficult time this year to get the money to come to NASPA because my president asked a very good question, "Show me what your program is." I did not have a thing to show him.

If we are to raise it, I think NASPA owes it to the presidents, especially to the state universities where you are depending on taxpayers' money, to send out a letter from NASPA directly to the president and perhaps a copy to the controller, if the decision is unanimous or is passed here, saying, "This is an Association regulation," and not depend primarily on the representative from the institution going back and arguing the point with a president and possibly losing the opportunity to be represented in an organization like this.

I think we have that responsibility, and I think, in my case, I may have some difficulty in pointing out to him not only the fact that the organization was not able to present a program to the president or comptroller indicating an expense of maybe \$250.00 but at the same time saying we are now going to raise the dues. If this is a professional organization, I think he has a right to see from a letter from NASPA why the dues were raised, signed by the president or the head of the executive committee, thus relieving the individual of the responsibility of having to go to the president and saying this to him. I would be a little embarrassed to have to go into the president and say this to him this year.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thank you, Jim. Mark, do you want to comment?

VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE SMITH: Yes, and it is really not a comment to which there should be a negative response except that I have a negative reaction. We considered this, at least we considered the problem or the problems which may be created at the institutional level by this, for the institutional representatives. I am not so sure that we regretted this. I think some of us felt that this may be a time when the institutional representative and his president get together on what NASPA's program really is, and maybe it is about time.

My negative reaction is this, that I think it is very appropriate for NASPA from time to time to explain to the president of the institution what its program is. I am not sure this should be connected with the question of dues increase at all and be presented as a rationale or justification for this. I dislike this just a little bit. I think we ought to do it as a matter of course, rather than trying to argue him into allowing \$50.00 for NASPA from an institutional budget. I would like to see your point divorced from the question of dues increase, and I would like your reaction.

DEAN JAMES W. DEAN: Well, you offer me a suggestion

if you will, Mark, just exactly what I go and tell this man when I get back. First of all, I am going to take the program in to him, because he embarrassed me. For instance, when he says to me, "Do you know the American Nuclear Society" (which I have great faith in so far as a professional organization) "does not charge this kind of money," what do I say to the man? Do I give him the program and say, "This is it, and I want to tell you on top of that we have raised the dues to \$50.00."

You and I discussed NASPA over a period of years. In our particular case this man is for the organization 100 percent, but he also has to be challenged and is challenged through a variety of sources on the college campus, as to where taxpayers' money goes in a state that is conservative in this element.

I do think that I would feel better personally, Mark, if someone else says, "This was a group opinion of 300 or 400 professional people that this project is now to a phase in professionalism where we have to increase the money," and he substantiates my claim that I think it is worthwhile for my institution to belong to this organization, and at the same time he feels in good faith that he can go to his board or to anyone else coming in from Richmond, Virginia, for instance and saying, "This is the very reason why we have added \$50.00 for this particular phase of this, and I back it." Other than that, he has my verbal assurance that it is all worthwhile. This is my point.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Jim, my feeling on this is that, among other things, it is a matter of courtesy for us, and procedurally we can work out this thing to notify, probably through the dean, his president and controller, of our actions here to increase these dues, if it is approved.

As to the selling job on NASPA, what is it worth? Not "what does it cost?" but "What is it worth?" Jim, I think this is the job of all of us.

DEAN JAMES W. DEAN: I agree with you.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: All right. Anything else? Incidentally, Jim, this was a revelation to me. I asked the controller to furnish me with a list of all of the institutional memberships held by Washington State, and I was surprised. This was a two and a half page list. I also asked for the report to indicate the dues in 1952 and dues in 1962, and with few exceptions all of these had gone up, some by as much as 200 percent in ten years. This was interesting. I had no idea of the total number of institutional memberships that we held.

DEAN JAMES W. DEAN: I think your point is a good one. I only used the example for the reason that I do not

think the average dean is clued in on whether 50 or 75 organizations within his organization are cleared for budgets, and I think he does have a very weak standing point whenever he goes to the president and says, "Well, we are raising your particular fee, but I do not know about the rest of the organizations. I used one organization because he happened to snap that back and said, "I am just looking at a program from the American Nuclear Society. Where is yours?"

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: One of the things I think we have learned in the last two years is how much more effective our Commissions and special activities are, when the men can get together between annual Conference meetings. Look at the effectiveness of our Commission on Financial Aids. This has been a real going concern. We have given them limited extra financial support out of our NASPA resources, but this has been a real lively affair.

Commission III, we gave them a little extra money in connection with staying over a day or so at the Allerton Conference last spring. This was a highly productive thing. They really rolled up their sleeves and went to work.

Commission VIII, Ed Williamson's Commission -- we gave them extra money from the general budget so that they could hold an extra meeting or so. Gentlemen, this pays dividends.

My only feeling in this is that it is simply time, I think, that we go first class. All these men who want to work, who are eager to work for us, I just say it is time for us to go first class and properly support the proper activities of this Association, and quit depending on good will and institutional resources to back the play on some of the things we are trying to do. Let us do it as an Association. Any further comments?

... The question was called ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Ted calls the question. Further comments? This is an important matter. Are you ready to vote?

DEAN TURNER: Jack, we are voting only on the increase in dues at this time? Not on the registration?

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Only on the increase in dues. The action to increase the registration fees is fait accompli within the executive committee. This is within the province of the executive committee to establish the registration fees and this we have done. The matter of dues is your prerogative. Again, are you ready to vote? The question has been called. All those in favor say aye; opposed.

DEAN DEAN: I call for division of the house.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: I declare the ayes have it. James has challenged the call. Let us hear it again. All those in favor please say aye; opposed. I declare the ayes have it. It is so ordered, effective --

DEAN DuSHANE: It might be well to have a show of hands to eliminate all doubt, and there has been a call for a division.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Yes, thank you, Mr. Parliamentarian. All those in favor please show your hands. Carl, will you help us with this.

SECRETARY-TREASURER KNOX: I think it should be borne in mind that institutional representatives vote, or their representatives.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Yes, institutional representatives voting. Shorty, would you help us count this vote?

... Those in favor of the motion raised their hands and were counted. Then those who were opposed to the motion raised their hands and were counted ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: The vote I have recorded here is 76 for; 18 against.

DEAN SHELTON L. BEATTY (Pomona College): May I ask the question whether it would be too great a burden for the top administration to send a letter to the presidents or provosts anyway, annually, describing the work of NASPA, not as a part of explaining dues. If you wish to mention the dues, all right, but explaining what the program is.

It seems to me you called attention to two or three aspects of the present plans, and future plans for the development of this organization. It would be important for the presidents to know. I have not the slightest doubt that many presidents would be greatly impressed with the importance of what E. G. Williamson is going to be doing with this Foundation grant. This is a very timely and almost "hot" subject. I have a feeling that there is a real point to what the gentleman from VPI is saying, that regardless of us -- and as Mark was saying also -- there is a need for the presidents to understand what we are doing. I do not see any disadvantage in it, if it is not too great a burden on the top administration.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thank you very much. I would say either a letter, Shelton, or I think we have discussed the possibilities of perhaps a small brochure that will explain our purpose, our current program, for fairly wide distribution, one or the other. At least, Shelton, this shall be a matter we will bring up for discussion at the executive committee. I would agree with you. I think we need to do a

better job of explaining what we are about to the people who are important to us. Is there any further discussion?

DEAN MATTHEWS (University of Missouri): I move that a copy of our present program, along with the suggested brochure you have mentioned, along with the increase in dues, be sent to the president of each member of the Association.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Jack, a question on your motion before it is seconded. Sent directly to the president, or sent to the institutional representative for him?

DEAN MATTHEWS: The president of the institution.

... Cries of "No" ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Is there a second?

DEAN BEATTY: I second the motion.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Is there any discussion?

DEAN H. DONALD WINBIGLER (Stanford University): Mr. President, I feel fairly strongly that it is important that this information be available, and available in a form which can be presented to the presidents of our respective institutions, but that conditions on different campuses may vary and it is really the role of the institutional representative to determine how the information should be conveyed on a particular campus. I, for one, would like to see the information which has been suggested sent to the institutional representative for his decision as to how it is conveyed to the officers of his institution.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: You are recommending then that this motion be defeated?

DEAN WINBIGLER: Yes.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Further comment?

DEAN O. W. LACY (Trinity College): Call for the question.

DEAN BEATTY: Before the question is called, may I say that I do not think we should make a one way decision that forces those who think that their president needs a direct approach, to avoid that and go see him. I am not embarrassed to go see my president, not at all, but I think there is a real advantage of having a proposal about the work of NASPA sent to him directly. I intend to see him anyway. I am the one who persuaded him to join this organization. I have no hesitation about persuading him again about dues or anything else. He has a right to say no. He does not say yes to everything I propose, I am sure, but it seems to me there is some advantage in a direct approach to the

president, and I do not see what the disadvantages are. But I am perfectly willing to have it, if you wish, be in the form of a letter sent to the institutional representative with something in the first paragraph of the letter which implies that this is for the presentation to the president. I think my president would like to know that NASPA knows that he exists.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: You have now heard an argument for and an argument against the motion. Is there further discussion? Are you ready to vote?

DEAN THOMAS A. EMMET (University of Detroit): Why cannot we do both? Shelton's point is well taken, I think, and so is Don's. I think it is really up to the method and if there is, as he suggests, a motion or a paragraph in there that says to write to the president or that this is for the president, and so on, that is what we want. Or there is another alternative possibility and that would be that the secretary of the Association could do it by whichever method the institutional representative prefers, directly to the president or to the representative to give to the officer of the university. There is a lot of merit in everything that has been said. I think we are haggling about how best to do it. Maybe we can untie ourselves along those lines.

VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE SMITH: I think one thing you are overlooking, Tom, is that some of us have a relationship with our president which would make direct selling or advertisement or education to him something that he would not like very much. I will be very honest with you. I happen to work for an ex-president of NASPA, and I brought this to his attention. I asked him about these problems we might have at the institutional level, and his reactions are usually blunt, as some people know. He said, "You're the institutional representative. Go."

I will say this that the presidents these days are getting an awful lot of material from an awful lot of people, especially these fraternity organizations have a bad habit of sending things to the president for distribution to the dean, or something like that. I think really that there is nothing wrong with having this in the hands of the institutional representative to put where he wants, and give to the president as he relates to his president. I think in many ways that is the most flexible position -- not to do both.

DEAN EMMET: All right. (Laughter)

DEAN MATTHEWS (University of Missouri): Mr. Chairman, there are some of us who do not dictate to our presidents, and so for that category -- I agree with Mark, if he wants to do it his way, that is fine. I honor his judgment. By the same token, it seems to me that he should have a respect for those of us who have to operate in a little different environment.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Jack, I think we are not so big yet but if you have a special situation and would like to have this information mailed directly from the central office to your president, all it would take is a note to Carl Knox and it will be done this way, and he would happy to honor it. I think this is all it would take.

For the rest of us, in my case for instance, I would be much happier sometime when I am with my president to get him to read this at his own choice. But there is opportunity in this organization, I think, for us to make this kind of a request and have it honored. This would be my thinking about it. Does this make sense?

DEAN DuSHANE: I would like to move to amend to the effect that this explanatory material which can be used to justify our original membership and the increased cost in NASPA, accompanied by a copy of the program or a reproduction of what is in the program, accompanied by a roster of membership, be sent to each institutional representative, except in those cases in which the institutional representative wishes to have it sent directly to the president and so states to the secretary, it shall be done that way.

... Cries of "Second" ...

DEAN EMMET: Second.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: It has been moved and seconded and we now have an amendment to an amendment. Mr. Parliamentarian, how do we handle this? Are you ready to vote on this amendment?

DEAN DuSHANE: This was an amendment to Jack Matthews amendment.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: This has been seconded. Is there any further discussion? Are you ready to vote?

... Cries of "Can't hear" ...

DEAN DuSHANE: I moved to amend Jack Matthews' motion, seconded by Shelton Beatty, that this material be sent directly to the president, to amend it to be sent to the institutional representative, along with a roster of membership, except in those circumstances where the institutional representative asks that it be sent directly from NASPA to his president.

... The question was called ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: The question is called. Ready to vote? All those in favor say aye; opposed. So ordered. Now we go back and vote on the main motion as amended, correct? Are you ready to vote on the main motion?

... Cries of "Yes" ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Question. All those in favor say aye; opposed. It is so ordered.

VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE SMITH: Mr. President, I now ask for acceptance -- I'm glad you men put the gag on me this year. (Laughter) I now ask for acceptance of the report of action taken by the executive committee to increase the Conference registration fee to \$15.00, beginning with the Detroit Conference in 1964. This is a completed fact. This has been done, and I am simply asking for acceptance of the report and the action taken.

DIRECTOR PHILIP PRICE (New York University): I second the motion.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Discussion? Are you ready to accept this report? All those in favor please say aye; opposed. It is so ordered. Thank you very much, Mark.

The next item of business is the report from the Committee on Nominations and Place, "Shorty" Nowotny. Come up here, "Shorty."

... Cries of "Stand up" and "Sit down" ...

DEAN NOWOTNY (Report of Committee on Nominations and Place): Yes. Mark is my bodyguard. Stay right where you are, son. (Laughter) You know, we have a ten o'clock meeting. I hope there won't be too much controversy. (Laughter) Like the story I think Leo Isen told me about the old Texas boy who came home to east Texas one day and he saw his wife out in the back yard fighting with a wildcat. He got on top of the hen house and watched the fight. He said to a friend the next week, "I think that's the first fight I ever saw where I didn't give a damn who won." (Laughter and applause)

We have a report to make here on nominations and place. Last year at Philadelphia we had a big splurge and went pretty far ahead, largely because we wanted to set the Fiftieth Anniversary in 1968 in Urbana. That will be Fred Turner's farewell party. We have already voted to go in April of 1964 to Detroit, in April of 1965 to Washington, D.C., in 1966 to Seattle and 1967 to Lubbock, and 1968 to Urbana. Your committee recommends that we make no further plans at this meeting, but ask all of you to think in terms of inviting us to your campus, at Detroit in 1969. According to the calendar, in 1969 we should go eastward since the previous three meetings would have been Seattle, Lubbock and Urbana. So please come to Detroit next year prepared to invite us to come see you in 1969.

If there are no objections, that was approved by the executive committee. If anybody wishes to dissent, speak

now, brother, or forever hold your peace. Nobody speaks, so I got by all right, Mark. (Laughter)

I am doing a little studying up here, because there was an old country boy who could not talk very well. He stuttered. He was on one of these river boats one day, and he went up to the head navigator and was trying to tell him something. The navigator said, "Go back and write it down." This boy was a poet and he wrote:

Should old acquaintance be forgot
And never brought to mind?
Old Sarah Brown fell overboard
About a mile and a half behind. (Laughter)

We have a committee report of eleven people who met with this committee, and we had a very fruitful meeting. The committee is made up of five past presidents, and six members elected by you. I will read these five past presidents: Hocutt of Delaware, DuShane of Oregon, Turner of Illinois, Winbigler of Stanford, and the elected members: Zillman of Wisconsin, Ross of Ohio State, Shafer of Indiana, Etheridge of Miami, Nygreen of Kent State, and Foy of Auburn, Alabama.

These eleven people recommend as your officers for next year two Vice Presidents-Designate, and a President-Designate. We think we have come up with some fine talent. The thing that impressed all of us is that there were so many men available that we would be happy to have as our leaders. I feel sort of like the old gal who went into a store and said, "I want to buy a gas heater with enough B.T.U. to warm a b-u-t as big as a t-u-b." (Laughter) These boys are good. (Laughter and applause)

At nine-fifty Chicago time, we would like to nominate for President-Designate for this convention for NASPA the name of Victor Yanitelli, Director of Personnel of St. Peters College. We will make these nominations separately. We are not anxious to have nominations from the floor, but we urge you, if you have any, to make them. (Laughter)

DEAN J. JUAN REID (Colorado College): I second the nomination.

DEAN LACY (Trinity College): Mr. President, I move the nomination by acclamation.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: You have moved the nomination by acclamation.

DEAN JOHN C. HAYWARD (Bucknell University): I second the motion.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Are you ready to vote on the motion? All those in favor please say aye. Vic -- where is

Vic? Congratulations, Vic.

PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE YANITELLI: I am flat on my face. (Applause)

DEAN NOWOTNY: For Vice Presidents-Designate, two gentlemen, in alphabetical order: John Blackburn, Dean of Men at the University of Alabama, Robert Etheridge, Dean of Students, University of Miami, Oxford, Ohio. I move we vote for these in one package. If you have other nominations, you may make them.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Is there a second?

VICE PRESIDENT GWIN: I second the motion.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: It has been moved and seconded that we elect as Vice Presidents-Designate for the 1964-65 year Robert Etheridge and John Blackburn. Shorty asked if there are further nominations.

... The question was called ...

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: The question is called. All those in favor please say aye; opposed. Your new Vice Presidents for 1964-65 are Robert Etheridge and John Blackburn.

Vic, that was a short speech. We have a procedure here where we have a word from the President-Designate, speaking for his threesome, himself and his two Vice Presidents. Do you have any words of wisdom for us at this time? By the way, John Blackburn and Bob Etheridge, are you here this morning? Will you stand? (Applause as they arose) Vic.

PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE YANITELLI: I am awfully glad you elected fellows of the caliber of Blackburn and Etheridge to back me up. (Laughter)

There are three big moments in my life: One, when the Jesuits took me in, to the surprise of everyone (Laughter) including my mother. (Laughter) Two, when I got ordained, to my own surprise. Three, when you fellows have just been so wonderful. I thank you, and I can tell you only one thing, that Blackburn and Etheridge will work like the devil for you. (Laughter and applause)

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Thank you very much, Vic.

According to the program these seminar sessions are scheduled to start in about six minutes. John, you had planned to have one more commission report, but what about the timing?

VICE PRESIDENT GWIN: I think not, Jack.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Is there any further business to come before us at this time?

Further announcements of any kind?

SECRETARY-TREASURER KNOX: President Jack, Dave Robinson wanted it clearly understood, on the seminars this afternoon the title will be "Seminar VII -- U.S.E.S. in the College Placement Field." He wanted to be certain that the representatives did not come hoping to hear a complete discussion of college placement services.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thank you, Carl, for reminding me. This is an important seminar and quite frankly, the encroachment of the U.S.E.S. upon college and university functions has been a pretty lively topic, as most of you know. Are there any further announcements?

DEAN BEATTY: Mr. President, on the discussion of bringing education into the residence halls, we are going to have two additions to the program. One from the University of Illinois and one from Stanford University, with emphasis on a good deal of variety on ideas on which human beings may remain humans while living in the monolithic structures that are going up all over the nation.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thank you. I would remind you that our last business session is scheduled for tomorrow morning at nine o'clock. We still have a good amount of business to cover. May I implore you to be here promptly at nine o'clock.

DEAN TURNER: Jack, I do not know whether some of the other members happen to be Rotarians, but isn't it correct, Jim, that the Evanston Rotarian club meets at noon today at the North Shore Hotel, and you are going to be installed as the vice president or president? There is going to be an installation of officers and not much program, so I think a good many of us could get lunch and be back for the 1:15 meeting without hurting anyone's feelings.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Thank you. Any further commercials at this time? (Laughter) This is a pretty tight schedule from here on out on these various facets of the program. We encourage you to be on time. The meeting is adjourned.

... The Conference recessed at nine-fifty-five o'clock ...

THURSDAY MORNING SEMINAR III

June 27, 1963

Seminar III convened at ten o'clock, Chairman Lawrence Riggs, Dean of Students, DePauw University, presiding.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen: Welcome to Seminar III, "The Changing Sex Mores of Adolescents and Young Adults." I am sure this is a topic which concerns all of us and is a lesson of practical value to all of us.

I would like to begin by introducing some of the people who will participate as panel discussionists.

First, Dean Patricia Thrash, Dean of Women at Northwestern University. Then Dean Jorgen Thompson, Dean of Men of Augustana College. Louis Stamatakis has been called home because of the arrival of a new baby in his family, so he is participating in this panel in absentia. (Laughter) And Mr. Pitcher's plans had to change, and he was unable to be here apparently, so we have reduced the number of panelists.

I would like, at this point, to reduce your anxiety by saying that we have agreed, as panelists, that we will not give minor speeches after the major presentation but merely open one or two questions for discussion, and then hope to spend much of the time in open discussion. The physical arrangement here is a bit difficult for this, but we will try to ask your active participation following Dr. Kirkendall's presentation.

It is a very great privilege for me to be able to introduce Dr. Kirkendall. He is a man of great energy and vitality. You should know, first of all, that he has a son and a daughter, and an adopted son. He tells me that at one time he had a four-generation family in his household, so he is a man of family background. He graduated from Manhattan, Kansas, Kansas State College at Manhattan, did his graduate work at Teacher's College at Columbia University, and has held positions in every level of education, from elementary through higher education. These positions include Professor of Guidance and Education at the University of Oklahoma, and for the period since 1949, he has been Professor of Family Life at Oregon State University, in the state of Oregon.

He has had sixteen different summer and interim teaching assignments. His other experience includes advising student government, serving as President of the Pacific Northwest Conference on Family Relations, and, interestingly enough, the coach of debate, and, at another time, coach of wrestling.

DR. KIRKENDALL: At the same time.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: At the same time. Thank you, Dr. Kirkendall.

So you see, we have a man of wide experience in the field of education, and in dealing with young people.

He is the author of five books and over 120 magazine articles, and in the last fifteen years has appeared on 37 different campuses or before that number of organizations.

A man of this energy really baffles me, and yet I am sure we all agree that his influence in the field of education has been very great.

You no doubt have seen headlines recently about his appearances. He is on his way now to New York to talk to the editors of Look magazine about a possible edition of Look, at least part of which will be devoted to sex mores of young people. He will participate in a seminar conducted by Teacher's College at Columbia, about which some of you know, this summer. So he flies from one coast to the other, stopping in the middle here to do us the honor of spending this time with us.

These headlines -- he showed me a folder of headlines this morning -- run something like this: "'More Sex on Campus,' Says Expert." (Laughter) "Students See Nothing Wrong with Sex on Campus." And so forth.

It reminds me of the headline allegedly in a student newspaper saying, "The President of the College and the Dean of Women Have Decided to Stop Petting on the Campus." (Laughter)

Dr. Kirkendall, we are pleased that you have taken the time to come and share your experience and insights with us, and I can assure you that following your presentation there will be a lively discussion. (Applause)

DR. L. A. KIRKENDALL (Department of Family Life and Home Administration, Oregon State University): Dr. Riggs, Members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators: It is a privilege to be here. I suppose one of the privileges is to get an introduction such as the one which I have just been given.

Along with the various things I have done or tried to do, Dr. Riggs mentioned my family, and these tie together in a significant way, as far as I am concerned.

I think that among the occupational hazards of a person who is working in this field is his family, for they

help you to see that you are not as expert as you think you are, and that all of these things which are involved in flying from coast to coast may not actually work out in practice. So I have to come to places like this to get my ego rebuilt, and re-inflated, for the times when I am at home and get really sized up by accurate critics.

I remember a few years ago, when I was starting off on a trip like this -- as a matter of fact, I had received an invitation to come to Cincinnati for a talk -- I had come home that evening and mentioned at the table that I had received this invitation. My son, who was then about sixteen, said, "They asked you to come all the way to Cincinnati to speak to them?" And I said, "Yes." He said, "Well, I don't see what they see in you." (Laughter) So an introduction such as the one you have given, Dr. Riggs, will furnish me with the fuel I need for some little time now.

It is a privilege and an honor to have the chance to talk with you people on the subject which you have assigned to me, for this is an area in which I have spent a great deal of time and given a lot of thought, because I think, as my own experience has been in working with young people, it is an area of real concern.

We are facing some very difficult problems, I think, as we try to move from a period in which our standards and our practices have been very strongly geared to traditional and conventional patterns to one which is a more relaxed, a more open type of pattern.

The play "Green Pastures" portrays the untutored Negro's concept of God and heaven, and shows "De Lawd" coming to earth to appraise the results of His handiwork. He met a roistering, dissolute mankind and became very dissatisfied with what he found. After his decision to sweep the face of the earth clean and start over, he asked Noah to build the Ark.

He told Noah, "Dey's gonter be a flood. De levees is gonter bust an' everything dat's fastened down is comin' loose, but it ain't gonter float long, caize I'm gonter make a storm dat'll sink everythin' from a hencoop to a barn."

Thinking of mechanical and technical advances and the changes associated with them, it is easy to believe that "everything dat's fastened down is comin' loose." The evidence is all about us. Transcontinental freeways teeming with high-speed, high-powered cars are altering our whole transportation pattern; automatized factories are creating problems of unemployment; miraculous medical advances which lengthen life are changing the proportions of the age groups in the population; jet-propelled aircraft are bringing highly diverse cultures into close association; the awesome power of

thermonuclear weapons are threatening the existence of civilization.

These consequences of change are all about us and manifest in one way or another. We see them; we experience them. We also know, if we are realistic, that the forces which have produced them are also producing changes in our attitudes and patterns of inter-sex and family relationships. These forces, subtle, invisible, but irresistibly powerful, have created a maelstrom in the vortex of which we are all caught. Many people are not even aware of this. Others are uneasily aware that some important changes are occurring, but why and what can be done about them is a tremendously perplexing problem.

In the matter of sexual standards and sexual morality some very profound changes are occurring. These changes are the reflection of certain powerful forces which call for a far-reaching reappraisal of our common feelings toward and ways of thinking about sex. These forces include technological and scientific advances, the exceedingly rapid growth of the world's population, cultural interchange, shifting sex roles, attitudes which are a consequence of the scientific approach to thinking, and the welter of confusing and contradicting opinions which have arisen about sexual patterns.

As a result, a thoughtful and courageous re-thinking of our sexual attitudes from both the individual and social point of view is badly needed. If we refuse or fail to accept this responsibility for the clarification of values and the development of congruent attitudes, things will get worse, not better.

Reference is often made to the need for a positive, affirmative approach to the question of sexual standards. Thus Drs. Sylvanus and Evelyn Duvall, co-editors of the book "Sex Ways--In Fact and Fancy," introduced the book by saying "The Twentieth Century has seen a basic shift from sex-denial to sex-affirmation throughout our culture."

This is a statement with which I would like to agree, but I doubt that such a shift has occurred except in a spotty, uneven way, or that we grasp its significance. Perhaps its meaning and the need for it will become clearer if we examine some of the change-producing forces of which I have spoken.

First, as a result of medical and technological advances, the power of the fear-evoking deterrents which have long been used to control tabooed sexual behavior has declined markedly.

For ages, and with a reasonable validity, our sex standards have rested upon references to the dangers resulting

from transgressing the traditional and conventional standards of conduct.

Threats of dire consequences were used to support a standard of non-marital sexual abstinence -- the threats of venereal infection, unwanted conception, and social disapproval. These have been almost wiped out by

(a) prophylaxis and medication, which have made venereal disease less dreaded. Statistics citing their increase only prove the failure of fear as a deterrent. And there is a basis for the decline in the power of the threat, for with modern methods of detection and treatment, venereal diseases are certainly not the bugaboo they formerly were.

(b) contraception, which markedly cuts down on the likelihood of pregnancy. There is in the immediate future, if not right now, the practical certainty that conception can be prevented if desired. Whether the methods which will make this possible are used effectively is another matter, but control will be possible.

(c) the automobile and urban living, which make isolation and anonymity possible, and public opinion less oppressive. College-level youth in the United States are now accorded a marked measure of freedom from parental control and supervision. In urban centers particularly, they can develop associations with persons who are complete strangers to their parents. The automobile has made freedom from supervision easily available to most persons, whether they are in or out of college. A great many young people either have cars of their own or have other arrangements which give them access to automobiles. Good roads, speedy autos, and congested urban centers make possible quick movement to isolated places or to localities in which the couple are free from supervision. Sexual behavior can be engaged in with the practical assurance that it will never be known, and when it is known public censure and disapproval are much lighter than formerly.

What follows as the power of the fear-evoking deterrents declines? To quote the Reverend Joseph Fletcher in the book "Sex and Religion Today," "The only motivating force to turn to, to buttress our sexual ideals, is the positive one of love rather than the negative one of fear. It means that our sex standards will have to find a foundation in loyalty and devotion to some loved one -- based, that is to say, in a high commitment relationship ... The fundamental truth to get straight is that our sex standards in an era of medical technology and urban anonymity depend for their sanction upon devotion rather than dread.

"To use the language of formal ethics, a 'prudential' sex standard will no longer work, if the ideal is premarital

continence and marital monopoly. And when people have stuck to ideals out of fear of what will happen when they cheat, they are helpless when that crutch is gone. Fear as a motive is a crutch, a sign of weakness and not of strength."

There is a second factor involved in this basic shift from sex-denial to sex-affirmation to be considered here, which I want to put as vividly as I can. We have entered a sexual "economy of abundance" which also requires a different approach to the consideration of sexual ethics. We are all familiar with the economy of abundance resulting from our efficiency in the production of material goods. Our agricultural and industrial systems have produced foods and other commodities in an embarrassing plenty. As a result we have been forced to re-examine our traditional attitudes toward work and play, savings, the importance of maximum productivity, the use of leisure, and toward the economic system itself. The practice of the virtues which were important in an economy of scarcity seem only to get us into more trouble in an economy of abundance. The same things seems true with reference to the economy of abundance in the realm of sex.

We have entered a sexual economy of abundance in several ways. The first is in the matter of reproduction. For centuries and centuries the human race went along barely holding its own, so far as maintaining the race was concerned. The life span was short. War, famine, pestilence, disease, and other disasters kept the numbers of human beings at a level which did little more than insure race survival.

As a result our sexual standards came to rest upon the proposition that the natural and only proper use of sex was in the service of reproduction.

What now becomes of these attitudes in face of the "standing room only" signs now being hung out by the population experts? Even if their dire predictions are thwarted, our sexual standards certainly can no longer rest on the need to use sex always in the service of population growth.

A second way in which we have entered upon a sexual "economy of abundance" arises from improved health practices. Better nutrition and fewer debilitating childhood diseases, among other things, have made for earlier puberty, more vigorous, robust and energetic people, fewer children and less time devoted to child-rearing, and consequently people more able and ready to engage in sexual activities. Coupled with this is more leisure time and more emphasis on play and enjoyment. It might be said that these developments have added years to our life and life to our years.

Just as the flood of material goods forced us to reappraise our traditional attitudes toward work, savings, production, play and leisure, so now the flood of population,

better health, longer years, reservoirs of energy, and leisure time are forcing us to reappraise our sexual standards.

A third social force which is having marked impact upon conventional patterns of sexual behavior results from the intermingling of people and the exchanging of ideas which now involve persons of all races, all nationalities and all the world's religions. Within this century thousands of American young men and women have visited other cultures where they came in contact with other patterns of male-female relations, family life, and sexual expression. People from other lands are now visiting the United States with equal freedom. The ease and rapidity with which people now move to different parts of the world and the world-wide dissemination of ideas through mass media have meant that hundreds of thousands of Americans have seen or heard and read about other cultural patterns for handling sex, and equally as many people in other lands have heard about ours. In our shrunken globe the social and sexual patterns of one culture are over and over again challenged by being placed in immediate proximity to the social-sexual patterns of another culture.

The result is a growing tendency to question cultural patterns of all kinds (a tendency in keeping with our emphasis on "scientific inquiry") and a refusal to accept answers based upon provincial custom, arbitrary authority, or abstract references to "good" and "bad," or "right" and "wrong." Standards based upon the doctrinal teachings of a particular religious sect may be meaningful and persuasive to a small group within that sect. The maintenance of a persisting loyalty to these teachings, however, demands isolation and immobility, and these are rapidly becoming impossibilities.

So more and more the need to find some approach to standards which will permit a more nearly universal communication between cultures becomes obvious. Attempts to limit these considerations to males or females alone, to one particular culture, or one specific religious sect have become completely outmoded.

Still another factor of tremendous importance in altering our conventional patterns is the changing role of men and women. This change is most obvious for women, and draws more comment than does change in the masculine role. Today, as compared to a century ago, modern women have a markedly increased freedom to choose their own patterns of living, to compete freely with men, and to demand and receive "equal rights" in the realm of sex. They demand "freedom" and "satisfactions" which parallel the demands of men. Not only does this demand extend to the marital relationship but to the premarital relationship as well. For example, unmarried girls, either individually or in groups, may have

apartments of their own. Here they have freedom to invite friends of both sexes for unchaperoned visits and activities. From this it is an easy step to ask for similar freedoms in sexual participation.

Neither men nor women are able or wish to govern their relationships by the traditional role patterns. Under the impact of industrialization, urban living, education for women, and equal rights for all individuals regardless of sex, conventional sex roles have in good part gone the way of the fear-evoking deterrents.

One of the prized values of scientific inquiry is the questioning attitude. An attempt to determine cause and effect, to know both immediate and long-range consequences, to think rationally on all issues, and to understand the principles which operate in any particular situation -- these are part and parcel of the scientific method. Children are told to ask questions, curiosity is encouraged, and a probing mind is a virtue -- except when it comes to sex. This is an area in which we have striven desperately to exclude the scientific method, yet it is through research that we develop the knowledge and insights which are essential for coping with the problems we face.

But even in this field the influence of the scientific approach has been felt. For example, refraining from masturbation was, at the turn of the century, definitely a moral issue. The disapproval of masturbation by religious authorities was supported by statements from medical authorities. Masturbation was said to lead to physical and psychological consequences almost too serious to contemplate.

As research demonstrated the almost universal use of masturbation, however, and as clinical investigation failed to reveal the terrible consequences which were supposed to result, the pressure against it relaxed. Today the modern literature on masturbation reflects relatively little of the severe moral disapproval which formerly surrounded the practice. In fact, statements from reputable professional people are available suggesting that masturbation has positive psychological consequences. And so a taboo and a bugaboo has been giving way to the force of scientific inquiry.

Extra-marital sex relations were formerly considered adequate cause for divorce, and common opinion was that no marriage could withstand the consequences of extra-marital sexual experience on the part of one of the partners.

Again research has revealed a greater prevalence of extra-marital sexual experience than might have been expected, and clinical data have demonstrated that some marriages do stand up under its impact. In fact, as with masturbation, statements can be found to the effect that extra-marital sexual experience can even be handled in such

a manner that a strengthening of the marriage relationship could result.

The trend in regard to sex standards has been under scrutiny. Dr. Ira Reiss in a recent book, "Premarital Sex Standards in America," has distinguished not one standard but four, each of which has certain adherents. These standards are (a) chastity before marriage, (b) the double standard, (c) sexual permissiveness with affection, and (d) sexual permissiveness without affection. Reiss, after his study, feels that (a) and (b) are declining in strength, that (d) will never have many adherents, and that (c) is probably the coming sex standard.

Coupled with research is a marked freedom to discuss sexual subjects openly in the popular literature and other media for mass communication. No one who has worked in the field can doubt this.

Whether one likes this is quite beside the point. The fact is that the trend is to examine sexual behavior scientifically, and without doubt even more severely-tabooed aspects of sexual behavior will come under scrutiny and be discussed openly. Already there are studies on homosexuality, premarital sexual patterns, illegitimacy, sexual offenses and sexual offenders, and sexual promiscuity. They all suggest the impossibility of keeping sex a taboo subject, and of enforcing social standards from positions which cannot be supported by scientific inquiry.

These then are some of the factors producing the maelstrom -- how do we emerge from it? By challenging our thinking sharply, and by being realistic about the circumstances as they exist. This does not imply acceptance or rejection, it implies objective analysis.

There are at least four conditions which I feel we must accept as realities if we are to be helpful to young people. They are as follows.

1. The power of the fear-evoking deterrents which have been used for the control of sexual behavior is destined to decline even further. Thus, contraceptive information and devices are certain to become increasingly effective, and more and more available. This is the consequence of scientific and medical developments, and should not surprise us, for the whole thrust of science is to render less dangerous that which threatens us, to illuminate the unknown, to bring that which is uncontrolled under control.

There are likewise social forces which are making for changes, e.g., the cultural intermingling of which I have already spoken.

I also anticipate that change will be accelerated. It certainly will not slow down. The consequence is that

alterations in conventional patterns of sexual behavior are inevitable; we are even now seeing their emergence. Our task is to provide the most intelligent and understanding direction possible. Failure to cope with the situation we face only complicates the problem. It leaves the solution to chance and abandons the field to vested interests. All around us various cultural factors and forces are operating to condition and channel the sexual attitudes and behavior of the total population. This brings me to the second reality.

2. Our best hope for dealing with the sexual uncertainties of the present time is complete openness and honesty with reference to sexual matters. We are far from this condition now, but this is the direction in which we must move as rapidly as we can. With this kind of openness on all sides of us we can afford nothing less in the college-university community.

3. The problem is more an adult problem than it is a youth problem. I say this in spite of the title which I have used this morning, and I say it for several reasons. In the first place, I find it very possible to work with youth. They are confused, perplexed, seeking help. They are not sex-obsessed; that phrase is best applied to commercial interests trying to sell their products through sexual titillation and excitation. Newspapers, advertising and other popular media of mass communication seem particularly prone to do this.

College-level young people themselves are in general more mature, much more straight-forward, more honest than most adults when it comes to thinking about and searching for meaningful answers to today's sexual dilemmas. They talk freely, they weigh possibilities and circumstances, and are willing to and do modify their patterns of behavior as they see the desirability for doing so.

What has happened is that as people age they frequently become prisoners of the very fears and hypocrisies which they have helped to perpetuate as instruments of social control. Our society has a crippling fear of public disapproval of an interest in sexual matters, and/or the wave of experimentation which might follow the open discussion of sex. This fear, which reflects the general fear which pervades our whole society, makes both teachers and administrators evasive and dishonest when issues arise involving sex.

This fear is an ancient one, and it has been much reinforced by the extensive influence of Freudian concepts. Freud felt that both the individual and society were constantly threatened by powerful impulses seeking to break through individual controls, and to attain satisfaction at whatever cost. The sexual impulse especially was always striving for expression, and always endangering social relationships.

Strong drives toward satisfaction of the sexual impulse exist; this cannot be denied. Yet we have other strong impulses which we can and do deal with quite objectively, and which are subject to direction. It is the marked suspicion of sex and our inability to deal with our sexual feelings and needs straightforwardly, which have made direction of the sexual impulse so much more difficult than it would have been otherwise.

We can afford to be much more optimistic about the educability of the sexual side of our nature, and the extent to which it can be directed. I speak from over 30 years' experience in working very closely with young people concerning all kinds of sexual problems and experiences. I began with the typical fear-ridden concepts which commonly surround human sexuality, but over the years I have come to realize that the sexual side of our nature is as much subject to direction and modification as any other aspect of our make-up. It is no more a threat to our stability and good adjustment than our aggressive impulses, if as much. Professional workers who can view sex in its widest perspectives can be frank, honest, and forthright, and at the same time helpful, understanding, and sympathetic in their work with youth.

This is, in fact, the only way they can be helpful.

4. We have allowed a mass of contradictions and incongruities to develop which confuse the efforts of both youth and adults to deal rationally with the matter of sex standards. These contradictions are many; only a few are mentioned. But they indicate how confusing is the whole picture, and how much study is needed to give adequate direction in our society. For example:

1. Our society is generally considered to stand firmly for premarital chastity, sexual sobriety, and a minimum of premarital sexual experimentation; but

(a) Adults use sex as a lure in business promotion enterprises;

(b) Some of the religious teachings supporting these standards are now being challenged or reinterpreted, and at the same time cultural changes are producing additional conflicts; and

(c) Virgin boys report that adults have never given them support in maintenance of their chastity, and that in their own peer group they feel quite defensive concerning their lack of experience. In most cases the adults have no knowledge of the sexual pattern which the youth of their acquaintance are following unless it has been brought to open attention by some misadventure.

2. Sex is regarded as a very "delicate" subject; yet books, plays, magazines, and mass media treat sex very openly and make it seem an enticing, exciting pastime in which the chief fault is getting caught.

3. Men and women are supposed to be understanding and mutually respectful of one another; but "the double standard" of sexual conduct permits emotional and sexual expressions to members of one sex which are denied to members of the other. On the other hand some data indicate certain male-female differences which may suggest a need for some differentiation in standards. Some of these differences may be inherent; others are deeply embedded in our culture.

4. We have tended to regard permissive cultures as less civilized and less advanced than our own; but the multiplication of contacts through visitors and informational media makes it clear that we could, and probably should, learn much from these cultures.

5. We feel that the sexual function, for the protection of individuals and the social structure, should be exercised in the context of love; yet some evidence indicates that certain negative consequences of premarital experience are less frequent in the more permissive cultures.

6. Parents, teachers, and religious leaders often teach that premarital intercourse will be very likely to cause guilt and distrust, or interfere with marital adjustments; but

(a) Some studies indicate that engaged couples experiencing premarital intercourse state that it strengthens their relationships;

(b) Some investigators suggest that premarital intercourse may at least be related if not conducive to more effective sexual adjustments in marriage; and

(c) They are supported by some counselors, therapists, and philosophers who see positive values in such experiences.

And so it goes! What can we believe?

How can we help the youth we work with to make sense out of the confusion they face in the area of sex? I make these suggestions.

1. We need to cast aside our own fears, inhibitions and pruderies and deal with the issues we face honestly and courageously. This point has already been dealt with at length.

2. Youth need help in developing a value framework which will have meaning in terms of their needs and level of development. With the collapse of the power of the negative, fear-evoking deterrents those social controls which have been based upon a rigidly-established pattern of action must be replaced with individual internalized controls which will stabilize family life and promote personal fulfillment even in the midst of conflict and change. This means, as I see it, that all standards, sex standards included, must rest upon principles which call forth loyalty and devotion and which cut across the traditional sex, religious, racial and cultural barriers. Differences should be appreciated and accepted, yet the principles dictating moral choices must cut through them, to rest ultimately upon that which is common to all mankind -- their essential humanity.

A satisfactory moral-ethical value system must be based upon the basic and inherent characteristics of man. This obviously opens the doors for controversy and uncertainty for we are still discovering the nature of man. Despite this uncertainty, the evidence that man is by nature a social animal is mounting. Various scientists have amassed evidence indicating that while man has conflicting impulses in his nature, the cooperative, outreaching, altruistic impulses predominate and will triumph when given an opportunity.

The evidence for this view of human nature is far more convincing to me than evidence for the view that man is essentially hostile and unsocial, or that he is, by nature, goodness in all its purity. I believe that man's nature demands satisfying associations in which he can feel secure and in which he can reveal himself and find acceptance.

If man is by nature a social animal, then his moral code needs to be directed toward helping him develop his social capacities to the maximum. Certainly a moral code which stresses a pattern of conduct contrary to basic human nature will face tremendous difficulties in enforcement, even in existing.

It comes down to this -- our moral code should encourage and support those attitudes and experiences which will actualize man's sociality, rather than concentrating upon maintaining prescribed or proscribed patterns of behavior. Basing moral judgments wholly upon the commission or omission of acts has become completely impractical as a result of the various developments already mentioned. Our task is to find a value framework which will enable us to interpret all behavior within its context.

These are the considerations which have crystallized for me the idea that morally our first concern should be for the development of effective interpersonal relationships. It was this which led me to write:

"Whenever a decision or a choice is to be made concerning behavior, the moral decision will be the one which works toward the creation of trust, confidence, and integrity in relationships. It should increase the capacity of individuals to cooperate and enhance the sense of self-respect in the individual. Acts which create distrust, suspicion, and misunderstanding, which build barriers and destroy integrity, are immoral. They decrease the individual's sense of self-respect, and rather than producing a capacity to work together they separate people and break down the capacity for communication."

This position is immediately equated by some with complete permissiveness and a laissez-faire, "anything-goes" attitude. The people who raise this issue are concerned with how strict we should be in impressing standards. This is a different matter. The issue I am raising is concerned with the foundation upon which our standards should rest. This, it seems to me, must be our first decision. When this has been reached we can then decide how to proceed with enforcement and what measure of strictness is needed.

So far as sexual freedom is concerned it is already here as plenty of research has shown. Furthermore, in general it is being very badly used as my book, "Premarital Intercourse and Interpersonal Relationships" demonstrates. No one, I believe, could support the extensive exploitation and shocking misuse of persons found in so many of the experiences reported there. But the remedy will be found in attacking exploitiveness, deceit and lack of integrity as the evils rather than attacking sex because it is sex. With the first approach we become concerned with the moral use of all our capacities rather than one alone. We also begin to realize that sexual exploitation is not the only immorality in our society. In fact when one regards the many manifestations of "man's inhumanity to man" sex is clearly not even the major one.

In closing I would like to consider some data which I think suggest that the approach I have outlined has validity. They also suggest directions for you as you work out programs concerned with student behavior and conduct.

In an effort to ascertain student reactions to ways of arriving at right-wrong, or moral decisions, I prepared the "Ballot on Bases for Decision-Making". The ballot incorporated the common methods utilized by people in making right-wrong decisions. The first choice represents sheer submission to authority; the second acceptance of common practice (social conformity); the third, interpersonal relationships, the criterion I have just suggested; and finally, reliance upon the guidance of conscience. I received replies from 1,394 college-level men and women with the results shown.

BALLOT ON DECISION-MAKING BASES

(Encircle) Sex: Male Female

In our daily lives and in family living, many decisions about conduct, attitudes, and experiences have to be made. We often ask, "Is it right or wrong?" to do some particular thing.

How shall such decisions be made? Practically all right-wrong decisions are made in accordance with one of the following four standards. In terms of creating the kind of society you would be like, which of these standards do you feel would be the best one to follow? Please mark one of the four. Place an X in the blank before the one you favor.

- ☐ 1. Relying on what some authority says is the thing to do. This authority might be a church official, or parent, some very learned person, or some established statement of what ought to be.
- ☐ 2. Relying on what is the customary practice or procedure in the community or country in which you live.
- ☐ 3. Deciding in accordance with the principle of doing those things which will create trust, confidence and good will among people, and produce sincerity and integrity in relationships.
- ☐ 4. Relying on what conscience says the right thing to do. What each person feels is the right thing for him to do is right.

PERCENTAGES** SELECTING EACH CHOICE

Choice	Male (N=590)	Female (N=804)	Total (N=1394)
1	6	6	6
2	6	5	6
3	48	46	48
4	40	42	41
	100	99	101

**Percentages rounded to nearest whole figure.

Let us remember that their markings represent intellectual responses; the basis actually utilized in decision making may be something other than the one marked.

What can be learned from the data secured from the 1,394 students?

The thing which stands out is the clean-cut rejection of the first two bases. The students reject both authoritarian pronouncements concerning moral behavior, and also dependence upon mores and custom. Intellectually at least they do not conceive of themselves as "other-directed." They are concerned for the quality of relationships; and they do wish to rely upon their own judgment in moral decision-making.

If the meaning of these data extended no further than simply that the choices were marked this way the significance would not be too great. But much more is involved. I think these outcomes say something about the nature of people and the characteristics of the students with whom we are dealing.

As I have said, I believe man is by nature a social animal. His need for relatedness provides the meaning for his life, and is at the core of his being. It is in his successes and failures as a social being that he enjoys his greatest satisfactions, or suffers his greatest miseries. Hence the obvious concern for relationships evidenced in these markings.

At the same time the normal individual wishes to be autonomous. He recognizes that he has certain inherent capacities for rational thinking and for making judgements. He wishes to stand on his own two feet and to exercise these powers. Hence the almost equally heavy reliance upon conscience as the bases for moral-ethical decision-making.

If this analysis is correct it then means that programs designed to influence student conduct and behavior are doomed to ineffectuality if they rely upon authoritative pronouncements which lay down right-wrong patterns of behavior. They will likewise be ineffectual if they rely for their power upon adherence to customary patterns of behavior. My guess is that the experiences of a lot of deans will substantiate this observation.

It also means that if we wish to influence our students they will need to be approached as rational, autonomous beings ready to utilize facts, and also willing and desirous of moving toward meaningful interpersonal relationships. They will reject half-truths, one-sided presentations, and biased and manipulative approaches in adult analyses. So far as sexual standards are concerned you are, at the college-university level, dealing with young people who are in a position to and do make their own decisions about standards. They are thinking young people who desire the best in their interpersonal relationships and who are soundly moral in the best sense of the word. Our failure lies in our

inability to recognize and accept these qualities in the youth we deal with. The genius of our task is to capitalize upon and to develop these capacities.

This is a task which far transcends a concern limited to sexual matters alone; it involves the problem of working out a more penetrating and a more challenging approach to moral-ethical thinking than we have yet devised. There are formidable obstacles facing us as we attempt to do this, but I hope we can tackle them with as much zest as we display for teaching calculus to elementary school children, or three-year-olds to read. And I am sure it is a task of even greater significance.

In closing I would like to quote a paragraph I find laden with meaning for this time and for the challenge before us:

...It is a simple thing to say what we believe. And what a difficult thing, sometimes almost an impossible thing, it is to do and to be. But we can bind ourselves ever more firmly to the vision of a truly ethical life. We can pledge ourselves, each in his own way, to strive to climb ever higher toward that level of life. It will not be easy. There will be discouragements and endless frustrations. And it will take courage, simple courage. Yet, as the epitaph in the ancient Greek anthology has it:

A ship-wrecked sailor, buried on this coast,
bids thee set sail;
Full many a gallant bark, when we were lost,
weathered the gale."

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: Thank you very much, Dr. Kirkendall. I am certain that we feel this is an optimistic and hopeful point of view, one that challenges us and leaves us with many questions.

I wonder if either of our panelists have comments they would like to make, that they would like to toss around for a few minutes before we open up for general questions and comments from our audience.

Miss Thrash.

DEAN PATRICIA A. THRASH (Northwestern University): As I told Dr. Kirkendall when we were talking about some of the ideas that he was bringing out before he gave the speech, certainly what he has said is all-inclusive, and I think most of us would be in complete agreement with the observations he made. The thing that brings this topic home to us is "Just how does it relate to our responsibilities on our particular campus?" And I think that is where most of us would like to have some discussions today.

I would just like to comment on one point he made and that is on this whole area of the changing sex roles of men and women. And I would like to recommend to you, if most of you gentlemen have not read it already, a very provocative book, "The Feminine Mystique," by Betty Friedan. She brings out this whole point that possibly the problem for women today is not one of sex but one of what her identity is, and I think this ties in very well with what Dr. Kirkendall said, that so many of our concerns today are not just in this area of what is sex and how shall we express our needs in this area, but who are we and where are we going, and by what means do we achieve our real identities.

So I would like to recommend that book to you. Maybe your wives have already read it, and have lain awake nights thinking about it. I doubt it, but it is very provocative.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: Thank you. Dean Thompson.

DEAN JORGEN S. THOMPSON (Augustana College): Well, I think it is always helpful if we can consider cases because it makes it a little bit easier to think of the problems we run into. As deans we are in a somewhat different position perhaps than Mr. Kirkendall when he is talking about the theory of educating our young people to certain standards. We have a situation come up in which, let us say, a young woman has spent the night out in a dormitory with one of the male students on the campus, and we have the question of perhaps they have had relationships, and perhaps they have not. They are at least suspect. What do you do with a situation like this, and how do you communicate some kind of a standard to the student?

I could cite one instance of a young woman who recently was involved in a real rebellion against authority of any kind. She was very angry toward her parents, and her expression of this anger manifested itself in being very friendly with any and all male students with whom she happened to come in contact. She maintained that her activities, the kissing and petting and other relationships she had with these boys, was purely platonic -- there was a buddy kind of a relationship.

Now, I am not sure that the fellows understood this relationship in quite the same fashion. (Laughter) She maintained that she wanted to have all kinds of experiences, and for this reason she would stay out of the dormitory all night, she would go to what lengths I do not know. The fellows had some stories about her and some nick-names that were pretty tough. Yet she never did admit to anything that she felt was out of the way. And when we asked her, "Well, now, do you feel that you have any responsibility to other people in your actions? You say that you are free to make your own decisions," and along this line, Dr. Kirkendall, she

would be saying that her own conscience was her guide and that she was not doing anything out of line with her own conscience. I raised the question with her, "Do you ever feel that you're responsible for what happens to other people?" She said, "No." She said, "They enter into any relationship, these other people, on their own volition, and what they do is their business. Therefore, this is no concern of mine because I am not influencing them in any way."

From my own position, I could not feel that this young lady had the right point of view, yet how do we get to convincing her and other students that this is not the right point of view? We are living with this situation. To get them to some commonality of the pragmatists, if that is what we are looking for, is a rather difficult thing when you have all kinds of different standards.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: Yet, she felt for herself that this was a right point of view, didn't she?

DEAN THOMPSON: Well, she said she felt this way, on one hand. I think she felt she was up against the wall talking to us, and in a sense she was. (Laughter) When you are talking to a dean about something like this it is a little different maybe than discussing the matter with the college pastor or chaplain, who may or may not have any disciplinary relationship. But as we talked on later, she did admit that she had certain standards, and that probably she had been out of line.

This is a long story, but I am concerned about this point you made that we should allow, or wait for the student to act on the basis of their own convictions, their own conscience, without setting any kind of arbitrary standards. How do we as Deans do this?

DR. KIRKENDALL: I would be glad to comment a little bit, and then probably you will want to comment back.

Your question began with "How do you communicate some standards to the students? And then you gave the illustration of this particular girl with whom you had been working.

I would like to comment that I think that in this instance you have picked a situation involving a girl who apparently is quite disturbed. There is a total relationship pattern that must present a disturbance. What I would anticipate that what is going to have to be involved here, right in the beginning, is some very careful counseling help to help her think through.

Now, I notice that you said later she did admit certain standards and had probably been out of line, which

implied to me that as you worked with her she herself began to re-examine her situation and perhaps worked more in the direction of relating. But I do not think you can do what you have to do with all individuals in all circumstances in the same way.

I said that you picked a situation in which we had, apparently, a rather seriously disturbed person, and here I think it would involve probably individual face-to-face work, counseling, and so on. But we also have in our colleges and universities a very, very large proportion of our young people who are not in such a disturbed situation but who are still seeking to know and to understand. And with this group I would want to approach it differently.

Here is where, as I said a moment ago, when I was speaking, I would like to work in the direction of developing a more open, a freer college and university community and try to communicate standards in this fashion.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: Some people might mis-interpret "freer college community." What do you mean?

DR. KIRKENDALL: I mean free in the sense of pulling down the barriers to communication, getting off the formal basis in which the deans are divided from the students, as you suggested, by the disciplinary function. At least there needs to be, I suppose -- I have not been a dean, and I suppose that you do have to exercise some of these disciplinary functions all right, but at the same time there has to be, I think, in our university communities, situations in which there is an opportunity for this free interchange without the disciplinary function distorting the thinking process.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: In other words, when many of these young people face problems -- let us take the disturbed group, and I think we have an increasing number of these on our campuses, people whose disturbances seem to center about sex, or at least become illustrative through some expression of sex -- there is a need, and if they find a permissiveness in being able to talk about this, either in a one-to-one relationship, or in a group, this helps.

In the group it strikes the level of a bull session, unfortunately, and never gets much higher than the insights within that group. In the individual context, we normally get a cathartic reaction first, with a good deal of defensiveness, to defend one's point of view, as you saw it, Dean Thompson. Here is the rationale back of this, and then a facing of one's self when it becomes safe to do this, and when you have support from someone else to face yourself and say, "Well, I realize that there is something that makes my conscience hurt about this behavior, although I can defend the behavior," and then one gets away from the need to so

protect himself, and this then is the beginning of recovery-- of course, all of this over a long period.

When you get away from the need of protecting one's self, as Dr. Kirkendall points out in one of his books -- reviewed, by the way, in our book list -- we sometimes have this accompanied by a self-destructive tendency. I mean, people who really depreciate themselves in so many different ways that it actually amounts to a kind of self-depreciation. They stay in the middle of this and get some security out of it.

Now, when sex becomes the content here, I think Dr. Kirkendall has been saying to us that our own attitudes and inhibitions, and our own backgrounds, out of which we have all grown, need some adjusting, and maybe we find this is one of the many areas where I am personally convinced that we sometimes operate on outworn premises, that our own personal attitudes are in the problem.

Our problem gets more complex because you have so many different attitudes in the campus community. I told Dr. Kirkendall of an instance that I know about where it was discovered that a young woman was pregnant, toward the end of the semester. The man involved was not in the community. Her parents and his parents were brought together. The families were given the problem as one to be solved within the context of family life, and it was decided that the young woman should continue to finish her schooling, which was a few weeks to the duration, since she had only recently become pregnant, and it would not have some of the obvious unfortunate effects of her presence.

One of her sorority sisters found out about this and came to an official of the college concerned complaining that this really was very discouraging because the college was not taking a firm stand. They knew that this girl was pregnant and yet here she was still in school.

I cite this case because I think it is interesting that it comes out of the student culture, and we get this a good deal from adult cultures and our old notion that something drastic and immediate and dangerous has to be done-- I mean threatened to the individual. I think that many of us agree, at least, that we have a more sentimental approach, because this too has its dangers, because people say "You're not doing anything because you're not taking drastic action."

Let me be clear. I know in talking to Dean Thrash we agreed that, generally, it is probably policy for pregnancies, when discovered, to have the young people involved not continue their education. There are practical reasons for this, not so much that we are trying to hurt them and get even with them, and yet, I confess that we might have in our campus, and certainly in our civic communities, many people

who feel that something ought to be done to punish; and this is a real problem as to how to handle this.

I have gone around a circle here, but I meant to get back to the problem of our need to be open and emphasize what Dr. Kirkendall said about this availability of a chance to talk openly about a subject that for so long has been taboo, but is not taboo in any of our public literature.

DEAN THRASH: I think probably more than almost any other area, this is an area in which deans have had to become educated and informed, and if they have not, they should have become more informed and have tried to grow. I think this is an area in which we no longer can really be disciplinarians. There may be standards that we uphold, but I feel, at least, in my own mind, that I certainly do not pass judgment on a student who comes into my office and who has the immediate problem of pregnancy. We have talked about this. The reason, I guess, is that this is the thing that shows, this is the thing that we cannot abide, and this is the thing that something has to be done about right away. The girl is here, and the baby is going to come, and this is an immediate problem. I think we are fortunate here in the fine relationship we have with our student health service. I think this is also something that house mothers find very difficult to understand, but I tell them that I do not want to know if a girl is pregnant so long as she is in relationship with someone in the health service who is helping her to work out this problem, who is helping her to communicate with her parents, who is helping her to go somewhere to have this child. This is my attitude. I do not feel it is a problem of discipline.

We used to have a regulation that said if a woman were secretly married she would be suspended for a quarter, but if she were pregnant we helped her. This is a counseling matter. So I got that taken out of the books. I felt we were penalizing a girl for being married, but not for being pregnant (laughter) and this did not seem to hold too much water to me.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: I would like to comment before Dr. Kirkendall speaks. I cannot resist the comment that maybe we are not divorcing ourselves from discipline, but maybe we are re-interpreting discipline. It seems to me that we cannot divorce ourselves. When we are concerned about the young people with whom we work, we have, whether we like it or not, the kind of function that is disciplinary in nature, but I think our interpretation of this is, hopefully now, much more in what I would call a mental hygiene atmosphere, rather than a punitive one.

I would still say that we have this kind of function that you were, in effect, carrying out a kind of disciplinary function when you worked for that girl's best interests in

doing the best thing for her, in taking some action. We are no longer equating discipline with punitive action only, although at times we all know this may enter the picture.

DEAN THRASH: Let me say one other thing. I think it is a little bit like Alan Paton, in "Too Late the Phalarope." He said the function of discipline is to restore -- and I think that is true -- our function is to restore, to help the person find himself and help the person find out what he is going to do from this particular point on.

DR. KIRKENDALL: I suppose that it is very natural, with the responsibilities which are pointed out, that we should move into problem situations of how are you going to handle this particular circumstance, or that particular circumstance. I would like to say, if we can get a better, you called it mental health environment, in our total college and university situation that I would hope you would have somewhat fewer problems in your office. I would like to suggest to you that as deans, I think, being concerned with what the total university environment is doing is something that is important.

Now, I am sure you will have to have some help from some other sources. But this question, "How do you communicate some standards," which you raised a while ago, I can see this all the time in the classes I teach. Since you are citing case situations, I would like to cite one.

I had a girl in one of my classes this year -- in fact I have more than one, but I am going to tell you about one -- I had a girl who came in one day, saying in essence that she and her boyfriend, who had been going together for about eight months, and were considering themselves semi-engaged, were in terrible turmoil because they had involved themselves in petting to the point where intercourse was the next thing, and yet neither of them seemed to want it, and what in the world were they going to do.

Now, I could have considered this a problem to have sent them somewhere, to call in a counselor, but in this instance I did not see disturbed young people. I saw confused, perplexed young people. So, to begin with, I gave both of them some material which I wanted them to read, and then I wanted them to come back and talk with me. I was seeking actually to open up the lines and channels of communication between the two of them so that they could really talk honestly and fairly, straightforwardly with one another about what they wanted, where they were going with their relationship, and what they anticipated in the future with each other. I did not, myself, try to make a decision -- I could not -- as to whether they should go ahead or not.

But in the end I had a final conversation with the two, and while they did not say directly, I think their

decision in this instance, though it could have gone in the other direction, was to avoid intercourse. But they said "We understand each other better. We are now able to communicate with each other. We are working together. We have even talked with our parents and we find a much better, much more relaxed, a happier situation." And I feel that this had achieved my objective, which was to help them open up the lines of communication and to work toward the improvement of the total relationship.

Now why am I telling you this? Because I think you ought to try to encourage classes, the offerings in the university which might permit this, conferences, the development of discussion groups in organizations, and this kind of thing. I think if you can get this going on many campuses that you would find probably fewer such circumstances coming to you or coming under circumstances in which you could handle them easier when they did come.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: We face some peculiar practical problems, Dr. Kirkendall, when we deal with several hundred students. You have given us clues as to how to reach more than one couple, but we feel it is important to deal with the campus atmosphere. As many of us feel it, our reach toward the campus atmosphere is limited often to the areas, frequently numerous, that we touch. Being specific, I know many schools are facing the question that is being raised, "Why can't we have women guests in our rooms," say the men, "after certain hours at night, under certain conditions?"

Now, this is a practical point that we cannot answer, because I suspect it is a problem for each individual campus. But I know where this point is raised, at times people say this is part of the atmosphere. What are we creating until we can get some assurances. If it was just this young couple, or our own sons and daughters, or the few people we know individually, we could say we have some verbal agreements, understandings, assurances. Are we over-protective in this, in our fears about what might happen in this kind of situation? This is the practical thing many of us face.

What do you think? Are we overly concerned about this sort of thing?

DR. KIRKENDALL: Well, I do not suppose this will be a direct head-on answer, but, I think if I were a dean and facing this problem, that one of the first things -- I might not be a dean very long; I don't know (laughter) -- but I think if I were facing this problem I would want to get this out in the open so there was a dialogue going on, involving the students who are concerned with this, involving the administration, also concerned with it, but from a different point of view, trying to see and understand what the issues were and why they are issues. And I would hope

that in this kind of an interchange we would begin to evolve some kind of understanding which would make it more possible to work out a pattern which would be acceptable to both the students and to the faculty and to the administration. I believe this can be done.

I remember one time working in a college community in which a pattern had grown up which was essentially this. This was a teacher's college at the time I was working in it. The pattern was that whenever anything a little different than the ordinary came along the students wanted a half-day off to attend. It had gotten to the point where the administration was feeling that their academic program was being diluted and they were getting evidence of it from the people who were employing the graduates of the college.

So their proposal was to tighten up, to just say "No, no more of this." At that moment I happened to be adviser of the student council in this particular school. I asked the president, and he consented to bring this before, in this instance, a small student body, but to bring it before our student body as an issue, and ask the administration to indicate why they were concerned with this, which they did. The result was that the students tightened up themselves, I think even more than the administration would have tightened on their own.

At any rate, there was an understanding, there was a pattern, or, rather a statement evolved, which I think was satisfactory to both groups, and I would feel that at least this is the direction in which I would start.

As I say, maybe I would not remain dean very long.

DEAN THOMPSON: I suspect most of us would not want to approach this problem from just the point of view of handling the emergencies that arise, as Dean Thrash has suggested, but we would like to try the positive, preventive approach, and on our campus, for instance, we do something I am sure lots of you do.

In orientation meetings with the freshmen we have a medical doctor who meets with the men and the women separately and discusses various phases of our personal hygiene, and so on, and among them heterosexual relationships. Then within the dormitories the women have programs where they have the college chaplains, the same college consulting physician, meet with them to discuss some of the facts about heterosexual relationships and some of the ramifications of these things, so that I suppose we are all using this approach in trying to get students to understand things that they do not understand, and to see the consequences of behavior, the interpersonal relationships that are going to come out of sexual relationships, which you cannot wait for the students to find out about, because it is when they are adults that

they realize what the consequences are. The child that is born an illegitimate child and finds out that he is illegitimate, this is when he gets into his difficulty. But the trouble is that the students are really not too rational, I am sure, when Joe and Suzy are sitting in the car together. Unfortunately, our intellect does not take over at this point, and determine our behavior, but rather our emotions. So it seems to me we want to try this preventive approach by pointing out all the concerns and, I think, my own personal opinion is that we should be rather definite in setting certain limits.

Now this is authoritarian, I suppose, yet within the Christian ethic I would feel that we have certain standards which we believe to be right, and for which I would not apologize in any sense. That is not to say we can impose them on another person, but we can say "This we believe is right, as far as interpersonal relations, because we know what happens to people when they violate some of these things later on, some of the concerns, the problems they have."

DR. KIRKENDALL: I think, if you have your lines of communication open and you are working with your students, you do not have to wait until later on. They are working in a situation and have feelings, of actions, reactions, right here and now, and I think if you are equipped, through your experience and your insight to talk with them about the interpersonal relationships that they are dealing with, the feelings of trust and confidence, the antagonisms, the hostilities, and show how this ties to their sexual behavior, they will understand it as of today, and this is the way I would get at it.

You spoke of striving for standards which you believe are right. I am quite ready to do that. But I do believe that I will have to explain what these are, so they can understand, so they can order their own programs and practices in relation to it.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: I think Dr. Kirkendall is pointing out to us that we may underestimate our students in their readiness to understand these fundamental bases of action. It is like the story of the father who called his sons in to talk to them about the matter of sex and announced this was his intention. And they said, "Well, now, Dad, what can we tell you?" (Laughter)

I think we may be in a position of having to accept the fact that our students have much more readiness for this kind of approach than we have been able, I think, to recognize.

Dr. Kirkendall has made available to us -- and these will be outside, is it?

DR. KIRKENDALL: I understand, Dean Knox --

SECRETARY-TREASURER KNOX: They will be at each one of the doors, except that far one there, and they will be distributed as you leave.

DR. KIRKENDALL: Can I say what they are? I had hoped these might be available to you before the meeting this morning, but I elaborated on this idea of interpersonal relationships as the basis for moral decision-making in a two-page statement here, and then, at the same time, put this Ballot for Decision-Making on there, and attached it, the four-choice matter that I spoke about. So you will have that, at any rate.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: I have moved over here because I can see you better, and therefore I would like to moderate the discussion.

SECRETARY-TREASURER KNOX: Can I add one more thing. There is quite an adequate supply at the office for any of your friends who are at other seminars. They can pick them up at the NASPA office.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: Thank you.

DEAN RALPH A. YOUNG (The College of Wooster): I would like to direct a question to Dr. Kirkendall. Is it unrealistic for a college to set a standard of chastity?

DR. KIRKENDALL: Yes, I would say so. Now, I do not want to, on the other hand, start the issue on the basis of chastity. I think what is realistic is that the college should set a standard that young men and women, older men and women as well, should learn to treat one another with genuine honesty, respect and sincerity, that they should put integrity and genuineness in their relationship. If out of this chastity grows, then okay. But I do not want to start out with making the issue that of chastity or non-chastity because I think that gets us into the same trap that we got lost in long ago.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: Thank you.

DEAN FRANK J. SIMES (Pennsylvania State University): It has been a very fine theoretical discussion.

DR. KIRKENDALL: It is not theoretical; it is practical.

DEAN SIMES: I am concerned about the fact, what are we to do with evidences of sexual immorality on our campuses, in our fraternities, in our residence halls? Are you saying to us that we should use as a criterion the fact of whether there is a good interpersonal relationship?

DR. KIRKENDALL: What I am trying to say is that I think as long as we start with sex as the central issue,

and continue to make that the core of the whole thing, we are going to be defeated.

Now, you can be concerned with their sexual behavior and their sexual patterns, but I think you have to be concerned with them in terms of what this does to their capacity as individuals, to relate themselves, to find relationships, and so on.

Now, you said a while ago "This is a nice, theoretical statement." I have worked with students in my own classes and on my own campus for fifteen years in this framework, and I am convinced every year, more than I was before, of its practicality. It does not mean that every individual or every couple who come into my class are thereupon convinced of chastity. I do not know that they are. But I do believe that if I have any effect at all, and I have seen some evidence that there has been an effect, that they come out feeling that there is a need for approaching each other in a fashion which stresses honesty, straightforwardness, integrity. And I would say that in the majority of cases, in the culture in which we live, which is laden with rivalries between men and women, with inadequacies, as far as our attitudes toward sex is concerned, I would say that in the big majority of cases they decide, particularly when their relationship is -- well, not well along toward engagement or marriage -- they decide in practically all of those cases, I should say, to avoid premarital intercourse.

Now, those who are up here on this end of the scale, where there is engagement, where they are more mature, may decide differently, but I am not engaged in trying to make a decision for them. I am engaged with trying to insist that the foundation upon which they make their decision shall be the kind about which I have been speaking.

This may seem to you to evade the issue. I am not attempting to do so. I am attempting to say where I think the crux of the issue is, you see.

DEAN SIMES: I am still concerned about the matter of standards. What are the standards that we are to communicate to the students? I wholly subscribe to the idea of having a full and open discussion among the students on campus. There are universities in the country, I dare say, where this has not been going on. I do not think this is a crucial issue, or one of the problems on the campus, that there is not this kind of an opportunity. But I am saying what do we communicate to the students about the standards that they should adhere to, and what do we draw on as resources and determination of the standards?

Is the matter of the kind of interpersonal relationship that they have the sole criterion of whether they do or do not engage in sexual intercourse, and whether we permit it or do not permit it?

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: I think the gentleman has probably asked this kind of question. Is it wrong for an institution, with its sense of responsibility and authority and jurisdiction in all these questions in the background, is it wrong for such an institution to set limits of behavior and thereby imply certain standards, recognizing that what Dr. Kirkendall has said is an educational approach, we cannot wait for this to be effective for everyone in effect?

DEAN THRASH: I would like to speak in defense of Dr. Kirkendall. I wish he were on our campus, and I agree with him. I think what he is saying can be a very practical thing.

I think that the university can have regulation, the women's government and the men's government can have regulations, but it has always been my experience, particularly with student government, A.W.S., that regulations are effective only when the students themselves vote for them, enforce them, and show that they are willing to support them.

A very concrete example of this on our campus is a regulation that our women's government used to have about dress in the classroom. It was the one regulation in the A.W.S. handbook that everybody laughed at, nobody bothered with. The professors did not seem disturbed if the students wore shorts to class. They took it out. They said "If we can't have something that is effective, let's take it out." I cannot see that a university can have a regulation saying men and women may not engage in sexual intercourse on our campus, because we cannot prove whether they are doing it or whether they are not doing it.

I would also agree -- I think any open-minded administrator knows that the climate on this campus and any other one is the climate Dr. Kirkendall has cited, of permissiveness with affection. I think many students, on this campus, and any campus, do decide their own standards of conduct in this area. I think if we can in some way convey to them this idea of personal honesty and concern for the other person, then if we can do that, if we can communicate with them, if we can encourage them to read and to think on their own, then, because the young man does care in a deeper way for the young woman, or the young woman does care for him, they are going to be concerned and try to seek ways in which they can have a relationship which is an honest one and which perhaps does not include premarital intercourse. But I think on a university campus, I cannot see, myself, as Dean of Women, saying to the Daily Northwestern "I am against premarital intercourse." I think the issue is a far deeper one than that.

DR. KIRKENDALL: I think perhaps I might state one thing that might help to clarify this a bit too. It seems to me that maybe we are tending to assume, as we speak about

interpersonal relationships, that we are thinking only of a couple in their relationship to one another. A man has more immediate need than face-to-face relationship with one another. I would feel that as an administrator on a campus you are having to develop an institution which has responsibilities to many persons, which has many pulls and tugs in different directions, and I think this would have to be taken into account too. It may be that out of this you say "This is the position we take as administrators for these reasons," and I would say that these are essentially interpersonal reasons too. I think maybe we seem to be working on too narrow a base, as far as relationship is concerned.

I do not know if that helps or not. I would be interested in knowing whether it does.

DEAN SIMES: Yes, sir, it does help. Again, I think this discussion is fine, and the approach is fine, as Dean Thrash said, to a situation on the campus. But when there are a lot of situations on the campus, I think the approach has to be a different one.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: Is it possible to have more than one approach, is what you are saying. You would be agreed that there has to be some education and an attempt toward this, but in the meantime, something more direct, you are saying, has to be said because the institution has to take a stand. Is that your point?

DEAN SIMES: Well, that is one of my points. I am concerned, too, if the basis for the development of standards is on whether there is genuine affection between the two, because then I think we are being hypocritical when we go to our students and say "Well, we think this is the logical basis for this kind of thing, but the board of trustees does not happen to think so, and neither do a lot of other people, so you just have to knock it off." (Laughter and applause)

DR. KIRKENDALL: Don't you get into the same problem when you deal with drinking?

... Cries of "No" ...

DR. KIRKENDALL: No? We do on our campus.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: Let's not talk about that one for a minute. (Laughter)

DANIEL GRIER (Purdue University): I am sorry that you do not have this mimeographed material of Dr. Kirkendall's. I think perhaps when you get it you will see that in some ways he is answering Dean Simes' questions, and some of the other ones. You may remember that he said he felt there were four standards on which students make decisions: one, relying on what some authority says is the thing to do; two,

relying on what is the customary practice or procedure in the community or country in which you live; three, deciding in accordance with the principle of doing those things which will create trust, confidence and good will among people, and produce sincerity and integrity in relationships; and four, relying on what conscience says is the right thing to do.

The figures there show that 89 percent of them voted in the last two, deciding in their own mind, in accordance with the principle of doing those things that create trust and confidence, or relying on what conscience says is the right thing to do.

This, to me, says, looking at this in a relatively superficial way, as I feel that a student would, "I'm going to decide what I'm going to do." Now this is the realistic picture which we face. We can say all we want to, but this is the picture we face. Eighty-nine percent of them say "We're going to do it the way we want to do it."

It seems to me that the low place of the first two choices answers our question, to some extent, because on what is conscience based? That is, what forms our conscience? What gives us the information we need to know in deciding about what would create trust, confidence, and so forth? It is what authorities, in the way of our parents, from age 2 days, and what the people, the adults in the community set as customary practice. This is what forms the conscience. Therefore, it seems to me that in our action, as student personnel administrators, we have to do what we can to develop the conscience of these individuals in terms of what the community accepts as right or wrong. So we have to know pretty clearly the picture in which we are operating.

Then, from a realistic basis, on the point that these kids are going to do what they want to do, as formed by conscience, we can work together with them. This, to me, seems to be the answer to the whole question right here.

I would argue perhaps a little bit, Dr. Kirkendall, with your dividing them up into four different things, because as I say, I think relying on what conscience says is the right thing to do is simply relying on what is customary practice, and what authority has said.

DR. KIRKENDALL: I agree that the conscience is educated to a point of view.

DEAN TED ZILLMAN (University of Wisconsin): Dean Riggs, I would like to raise a very practical question right now. I think we all appreciate that we are dealing in a very controversial area about which there is a variety of opinion. I want to ask, is this meeting being opened to the public press? If it is, I have some real fears and doubts

as to what may be communicated from it. To make my point, let me say, suppose we get back on our respective campuses tomorrow or the next day and find a headline "NASPA Agrees Permissiveness with Affection Okay." (Laughter) No definition of terms whatsoever.

In other words, this I believe will cause all of us some individual embarrassment and this organization no amount of explanation.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: And possibly an increased placement activity. (Laughter)

DEAN ZILLMAN: Seriously, is this being reported and is this open to the press?

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: Do you have an answer to this?

DEAN VIOLA KAMENA (University of Santa Clara): No, I do not have an answer to this, but I have an answer to the feeling of affection. (Laughter) I was a woman before I became a dean, and I am sure no girl could ever give herself to someone whom at that moment she was not in love with or that she felt was not in love with her, and after the fact that she was sure that he was in love with her. So I do not think you can base too much on affection, because I am sure that the girl feels she is in love, unless she is one of these troubled persons who is promiscuous.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: Will somebody answer the question about the press.

SECRETARY-TREASURER KNOX: I am quite certain that we are being covered by the press.

DEAN CHARLES H. RICHMOND (Oklahoma Central State College): I think one thing that caused our confusion is that as administrators we must know and interpret standards and ideals and limits of student conduct that our community, our board of regents, and our parents can support. But also, not only as administrators but as educators we are not policemen to go out and chase down these people who are not living up to these standards. But as educators it is the responsibility of the educational institution to use every effort possible to attain those standards. I think each one of us, in our schools, do have standards even though not written down on this. We have understood standards and limits set by our institutions and I think what our speaker was saying this morning is that this is his way of reaching those standards, in an educational institution, as a teacher in the classroom. I think we need more teachers in the classroom who will assist in attaining these standards and letting the students think these things through, until the standards of the institution become the standards of each student in that institution.

We are an educational institution, not a policing institution, but nevertheless there are times, as administrators, when we have to be judges and enforce a few of these standards and regulations.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: Or take action in relation to them.

DEAN JAMES W. REDDOCH (Louisiana State University): I would like to ask a question about the statistics that have been quoted several times. Was this a random sample or was it taken from your classroom; and if so, was it at the end of the semester?

DR. KIRKENDALL: It was taken from my classroom, the first day of class. It was not a random sample. It was students in the classes, but, as I say, the first day of class.

Could I make a comment here? I have heard you speaking about the standards of your community. Now I just wonder what those standards are. I think that this is the problem in which we are caught, that the standards have been in such a state of flux that the traditional approach to standards, as I was trying to point out, have been undermined, and to try to approach standards in the same manner that we have always done simply means, as I see it, that we are defeated.

We have thought so long in terms of a particular standard -- that is a standard based upon a blueprint of action -- that when we permit ourselves to acknowledge that maybe a prohibited action could occur it seems that we have lost all standards. This, I think, is not the case. I quoted from Drs. Sylvanus and Duvall, when they said that we need to shift from a negative to a positive, affirming kind of standard. Well, this is what is, I think, their suggestion, that we are concerned first with the way we live together as persons.

I am concerned with the sexual patterns, and behavior of young people. This book, which I spoke about, is my own authorship, "Premarital Intercourse and Interpersonal Relationships." You could not, I think, read a lot of the material in here and support it under any circumstances. There may be some you can, or there is some that I think you could, but the exploitation, the misuse of people, the manipulation of individuals, this is evil, and it is documented.

I am also concerned with the way we use the power in our arms, with our intellect, with our speech, with any of our special talents. We need to, I think, bring these all under an umbrella of judgment, which is the same, because the mistake we have made, I think, is to take the sexual side, pull it clear out of context, put it over here and try to deal with it, or refuse to deal with it in any way we use in dealing with any other aspects of our nature. This, I think,

is where we have gotten into trouble. The issue is not permissiveness or non-permissiveness. I get into these conferences and over and over again the issue becomes "How permissive can we be?"

I am not interested in how permissive can we be. I am interested in arguing how can we take our different capacities, our different talents, and integrate them into a life which has balance and purpose. This is where we have to work, I think. I think as long as we take any one of our capacities, whether it is the sexual capacity or any other, and isolate it and try to deal with it as though it was not a part of our total living, we are going to be in trouble. This is, I think, what I am trying to do. I think some college communities are moving in the direction of really looking, particularly, at the sexual part in that way.

DEAN G. R. SCHWARTZ (Western Illinois University): I think what bothers a number of people, according to the discussion that is coming out in the group, is that we have professional training and we are sympathetic toward the emerging values and standards of young people, as Dr. Kirkendall very, very beautifully describes the situation; but then we find ourselves in this community situation. I think Ted Zillman did a fine job of bringing it out, and probably what bothers him is we feel for the people at the University of Illinois, where a faculty member with a certain position was relieved of his responsibilities by the board, and our problem is we are in the middle and we respect both positions, the community attitudes and the young people's situation, which probably is an emerging mores kind of thing, say thirty years hence, and somehow we are involved in the problem of having to bridge the gap.

DEAN ZILLMAN: May I add to that too, before you respond, Dr. Kirkendall, that I think, as educators we are all terrifically interested in support of your program of education as being the solution to our troubles, but I think the thing that bothers so many of us is how are we, with our limited resources as student personnel people, to attack a problem such as this on a global front? And we are not dealing in the ideal situation of the wise father with his understanding son, who thinks his father still has some things to tell him, or the counsellor in the counseling center, or the good dean, or the professor in his classroom of 25 to 40 students; we are concerned with communicating -- and this is the basis of what I am trying to say -- the old bugaboo of communication. How do you get this over to 21,000 students, 15,000 of them still being at the undergraduate level, and 4,000 of them still being freshmen?

I think this is the thing that we have to direct our attention to, and bless you for any help you can give us on this problem.

DEAN THRASH: Let me undergird that by asking you,

how can you do it when your campus is even only 2500 women, or 3500 men? I would like to illustrate this thing. When that very helpful Journal of the Dean's came out on sex responsibilities, I read it and I was very impressed. Dr. Yeager in our health service read it, and Dr. Wolf in our mental health department, and I became very concerned in this whole area of education. We have a women's group of juniors and seniors in this group, that is a sort of an honorary, and they are concerned about what we can do to make this a more enlightened campus. I was talking to them about this whole area of education and how they can become better informed in this whole area as to what is their sexual responsibility and so on. They had the head of our mental health department over one evening for discussion, and afterward we were talking a little bit about what kind of programs they might set up in the dormitories or somewhere, but they really were rather quiet. Finally, one of the girls who was very nice said, "Dean Thrash, what is it you really want? We'd like to help you." (Laughter) She said, "If you will just tell us what you think it is we need, we'd like to help."

The thing that got to me then, and has impressed me since then, is that this area is a very personal area. They do not seem to want to go to a lecture hall with two hundred people in it and ask the man on sociology, or the man on gynecology, or the man on something else what to do about a situation. It is just the same way that women are about vocational conferences. They do not want a careers conference. They want to ask one specialist what to do in a particular given situation.

I am very interested in this because I was talking with the deans from another college, and they were telling me that one of the assistant deans was very frustrated because when this issue came out she thought it would be great at this institution if they had the same kind of lectures, and she received the same response. The students want to help you out, if you will just let them know what it is you want. But that is not the issue.

DR. KIRKENDALL: This gentleman was asking "How do you get this across to 21000 students?" I do not think you are going to get it across to any 21000 students all at once. I think it is going to have to be small doses here and there. The kind of thing that Dean Thrash is speaking about involved a small group. I think there are a lot of different ways of doing this. This is what I said a while ago. I think to really look over your campus resources and marshall your resources would be important. I had my attention called this last year to a program held at Oberlin College at Oberlin, Ohio. I do not know if anyone is here from Oberlin or not. Is there?

DEAN HOLDEMAN: Yes.

DR. KIRKENDALL: Did you not have a seminar on sex and human relations there this year?

DEAN HOLDEMAN: Right.

DR. KIRKENDALL: I do not know, I have only the program and a letter from a doctor there, but was this an effort which helped in getting over some of this point of view, do you think? (Laughter)

DEAN HOLDEMAN: I went through this last winter. We have gone through it in other ways. We tried a new approach of getting various people in on the subject. We have not had a firm evaluation and conviction of its merit as yet. I am perplexed. Ted and a lot of us are, on how you get this across. And I am perplexed about Frank Simes' question, and I am asking, while I have the floor, has the American climate changed so that we as deans allow sex freedom and so on, or are you saying to us that we have a stand yet to take, or are we to forget it all? This is, I think, Frank's question, because we are not sure.

DR. KIRKENDALL: I am saying that the climate has changed, but it has not changed in the sense that now you say forget it all. There is more misuse of sex, there is more exploitation now I think than there has been in a long, long time. I think the problem of the dean, of the administrators, of the teachers, among which I number myself, is to help people understand how to take their various capacities and integrate them into a life in which they are responsible toward one another. This, I think, is the central issue.

I believe it is true of automobile driving, just the same as it is of sex. I think there are some great immoralities in the area of automobile driving. I think when we come to the point where we can say that our function, our philosophy is that of taking these capacities and integrating them, tying them together in a responsible way, that then we will have positions to take which will be meaningful.

CHAIRMAN RIGGS: I am sorry to have to draw this to a conclusion, but the lunch hour is upon us.

I want to thank Dr. Kirkendall for his patience and his wisdom in helping us this morning. (Applause)

... The Conference recessed at twelve o'clock ...

FIFTH GENERAL SESSION

Thursday, June 27, 1963

The Conference reconvened at one-twenty-five o'clock, Chairman R. William Cheney, Dean of Students, Springfield College, presiding.

CHAIRMAN CHENEY: May I call our Fifth General Session to order.

In introducing our speaker today I am reminded of an experience I had some time ago. I was asked to speak at a P.T.A. meeting, and I arrived at the door of the school and was met by a chap who asked "Are you the guy who is going to speak tonight?" I replied in the affirmative, and he said, "I'm the gentleman who is going to introduce you." (Laughter)

Let me make it clear that in this instance I am the guy who is introducing a gentleman.

Our speaker is no stranger to this group, nor to this locale. Some years ago he spoke at our gathering of NASPA and some of the men in this room will remember that this address was a highlight of our NASPA Conference back in the early 50's.

It was also in this particular setting in Evanston that he did his graduate work at Northwestern, and at Garrett, and during this period met his very lovely and charming wife.

President Olds' life is an interesting study in contrast and diversity of experience. Born of a Catholic father and a Mormon mother, with a Quaker upbringing, Protestant practice, and Judaic study, Dr. Olds was reared on a farm, schooled in a sawmill and logging camp, and matured in the complex of Chicago's metropolitan area. He was graduated from Willamette University, then on to Garrett and Northwestern, for a B.D., and M.A., and a Ph.D. from Yale. He has served on the faculties of DePauw, Northwestern, as a University Fellow at Garrett, at the University of Denver, at Cornell, and at Yale, and came to Springfield College as its 8th President in 1958.

He participated in a number of international seminars in Canada and in Europe, and as the leader of the Sherwood Eddie tours to Russia in 1957.

His breadth of interest stretches from his early experience as a bandleader to guest editor of the Saturday Review, from an early career in boxing to an author of books on philosophy, ethics and education. He is in very heavy demand as a speaker and I feel we are very fortunate today to

have him take time from a very busy schedule to be on our rostrum. His topic is an intriguing one, "Pabulum, Professors, and the Catalyst of Change."

It is with great pleasure and deep personal pride that I present Dr. Glenn A. Olds. (Applause)

DR. GLENN A. OLDS (President, Springfield College): Thank you, Bill. It is too bad that his contract is already let for next year, to take into account the generosity of his introduction.

It is true that I am no stranger to this place and to this town, but I must say, until this moment I felt very much a stranger. I got in late last night, and being a sentimental Irishman, I was a bit nostalgic, having spent seven of the best years of my life here, so I set out to re-find some of those moments of meaning.

I went over to the church where we were married and found it locked. A symbol of the open door policy, no doubt, in our day. (Laughter)

I went from the locked church over to the campus to try to find my old office and classroom, and they were locked. A symbol of our open invitation to the eager students. (Laughter)

I then thought I would hurry over to the Orrington, where I had my first date with the girl who became my wife, to discover I arrived at 8:36 and they closed the dining room at 8:30. (Laughter)

By this time, I felt more than welcome. (Laughter)

I thought of making a quick trip to Howard Street, but my Mormon background precluded that. (Laughter)

I am only saying that it is good to be among friends finally. (Laughter)

Now, I have debated the strategy for this meeting. I discerned when I arrived, from the program, that you have sandwiched a philosopher between sex and the Peace Corps. (Laughter and applause)

I know enough about deans of students to know that philosophy is not always the most promising and appetizing fare for your fertile minds. And I suspect that to have been sandwiched between sex and the Peace Corps was at least the promise of your hope that no matter how dull or dreary the philosophy might be, there would be some in attendance. (Laughter)

Had I suspicioned, as well, that this was to happen

at 1:15, I fear I would have failed from sheer fright. But I have come a long way, and I have a lot I want to say. I have prepared a formal text and the gentleman has it. It is a pretext for what I want to say. (Laughter) I sweat blood and tears -- chiefly tears -- over the manuscript and you now have it, at no extra price, but one of my early teachers said, and I think he was very wise indeed, that to speak from a manuscript is like courting through a hedge. You can hear all right, but the contact is poor. (Laughter)

Having been an early student of Dr. Paul Schilpp, one of the great philosophical teachers, who is in the audience today, I know that Plato was right when he wrote, you remember, in *The Seventh Flag*, that if anyone were to really learn philosophy, he would have to discover it in dialogue and not through the ornery and ordinary prose of a manuscript. So I am going to talk, I hope, from the head. At least there will be some resemblance, I hope, between what I have to say and what you may read as a result of my manuscript.*

Stuart Chase in a recent article in *Saturday Review* sketched in bold strokes on a broad canvas the critical concerns of our contemporary culture. Because of their searching simplicity as well as their symbolic significance for the contemporary campus, I borrow his three "B's" as a backdrop of brevity. Bombs, Babies, and Bulldozers, he suggests, provide the unique facts and symbols for describing the pervasive problems of our time. They give a snapshot of our day in three dimensions; qualitative, quantitative, and in action. Incredible destructive powers, (the qualitative problem of meaning and management,) population explosion, (the quantitative problem of numbers and resources), and the desecration and disruption of nature (the procedural problem of change) do plot our unpleasant picture. But more, they cast a lengthening shadow over the college campus, and suggest clues for the four movements of my analysis:

- (1) The characteristics of our culture and campus
- (2) The contrasts and contradictions
- (3) The corrupting cures, and
- (4) The creativity of the coming campus.

And, some will have already sensed a somewhat strained symbolic connection with my own title; babies and pabulum, bombs and stirring students, and, however much it may offend our profession, bulldozers and professors.

I. Characteristics of our Culture and Campus:

Few would deny that our campus, like our culture, reflects the brooding brutality of the bomb -- the technical triumph of terror, security rooted in mutual fear, hot lines

*Dr. Olds addressed the Conference extemporaneously and presented his prepared text for inclusion in these proceedings.

in a cold war, the final frustration of brute force. To be sure, there has always been the counterpart of the bomb, but always before it has been limited, professionally controlled. Never did it threaten extinction of man. Never did the Promethean fire threaten to totally consume. It does now, and this the decisive difference. However the surface of our campus shimmers with serenity and security, deep within its life, as only you deans will know, is this dark side of a suspended doom's day -- rarely verbalized, slumbering often beneath a curious callousness about world affairs, but leaving an unmistakable stain of anxiety in the central quest of the self -- in sex, status, security, vocation, and ultimate commitment.

Like a mined field, the bomb threatens responsible passage, frustrates rational strategy, invites detours and diversions, and through the paralysis of uncertainty, commits much of our force to the security of sending signals across the no-man lands that must one day be bridged. It dwarfs the measure of man to a push button strategy of countdown and combustion. It taps the arteries of altruism, and drains them into a dismal pool of personal survival. It celebrates the paradox of all power; it is empty and feeds on itself, impotent to prescribe directive ends to control its use.

The tempting resolution of the paradox of power, is to turn it into an end itself -- an art as old as Thrasymachus who gave us through Plato's eloquent pen the bold phrase of this philosophy; "might makes right." This value concept of power and the psychology of "dooms day" takes a thousand forms on the college campus. It lives in the psychology and sanction of admissions policies and the ritual of rejection, softened by suggestion of a lower status possibility. (Living "down under" where "fall out" is less severe!) It lurks in the deadly practice of "final exams" -- impersonal, mechanical, and devastating. It lives in prerogatives of the professor who substitutes his position of power through "required courses" for competence and excitement in teaching. It crumbles wisdom and innocence before it in administration by fiat, and manipulation by propaganda. For these "timid" and "transcendent terrors" for the many, there are always the painful personal forms for the few -- the bomb which falls when parents die, when God is gone, when love is lost, from which grief laden ashes fall with deadly radiation. And always beneath and beyond these domestic versions lies the deeper, darker possibility, held in such frail hands by others like ourselves.

Babies are not new, even to college campuses, but in such number, so swiftly, they constitute a paralyzing problem. The problem of population has become a permanent part of our shrinking world. I leave to Stuart Chase and other competent critics the delineation of the global problem, the paradox of populations exploding precisely where they can least afford it. The campus counterpart concerns us here.

What do we do with such numbers for whom we lack adequate resources in teachers, facilities, and financing? What happens when natural appetite outruns rational resources?

There are some symbolic teasers here, even in the midst of our widely varied educational system. For those who do not believe in birth control in the realm of education, what is the relation of the appetite for offspring and responsibility for them? With so much polygamy and divorce practiced in relation to educational partners by our mobile students and publics, how do we ensure marriages of permanence that assume responsibility for the permanence of the home and offspring? (Note how many parents are possible through taxes; yet how fickle through choice!!) How long can the care package feeding of some campuses continue as rationed crisis? How balance out surpluses and starvation regionally and nationally in education? How do we adequately prepare for expected babies when they reach us all at once and in such numbers?

The sheer fact of number has already numbed us. Alma mater, or foster parent, has become mechanized incubator with the light always on. The concept of family has given way to fairground, and in the name of maturity, babies bloom before they are grown in cells of sunshine known as dorms, and wilt before the winter blight we call attrition. Were they to die at birth as swiftly and in such numbers as they do as freshman we would call a national emergency. Instead we describe it as natural selection to insure quality in public institutions.

And here is where the bulldozer sets to work. Never is its service called when the work required is delicate, or where a single shovel is required. No, bulldozers are for masses, and for messes made from masses. In the name of efficiency, and in deference to labor costs, Bulldozers are brilliantly effective. They can scratch out the artistry of nature's million years of writing in days. They can correct her eroding style, and bring mountains low. But, as Mr. Chase observes, we pay a dear price -- not only in man's moral and aesthetic sublimation to the mentality of a machine however useful, but in the deeper disruption of man's symbiotic relation to nature as partner and friend.

The mentality of mass manipulation, however efficient, has a deadly impact on the campus and in the subtle art of perfecting persons which at the deepest level is inescapably personal, singular and delicate. The logic of leveling, swift searing passes, across the delicate landscape of a life with the broad blade of academic efficiency, may make landing fields for unloading the cargo of heavy professors, but does not provide the fuel for getting the light craft of students aloft, and under their own power. Nor does this strained symbol relate to the current controversy over large or small classes, tape, TV or teachers. It simply

draws attention to the fact that some things in this world are too delicate for bulldozers -- and man is one of them.

A climate of anxiety, multiplication of numbers, the mentality of masses and machines -- these do describe our campus as well as our culture. But more important than these facts and symbols is the deeper contrast and contradiction they invoke.

II. Contrasts and Contradictions

Cultures, as well as campuses, have continuity. Though they may embrace swift and sudden change, they conserve and carry hard won gains of the past. Most cultural change is gradual and relative. Rarely, however, like the mutation of a new species, cultures and campuses experience dramatic change, radical new direction. Part of the qualitative change, reflected in the Bomb and Bulldozer, is that radical, and sets the campus in contradiction with itself.

Though it is true, as Professor Whitehead has reminded us, "Every simplification is an oversimplification;" I want to put the radical nature of this contradiction in as bold a light as I can and hence, dramatic simplification. There is not time here to trace or adequately discuss the classical types of campus culture surrounding the creative epochs in the development of higher education, only to call the roll:

- (1) The Greek academy and Lyceum with its model of dialogue as the clue to learning -- personal, dialectic, holistic, and speculative;
- (2) The Alexandrian University with its model of catalogue as the clue to learning -- collecting, conserving, organizing, rediscovering;
- (3) The Medieval university with its model of natural prologue as the clue to learning -- disciplined, obedient, synthetic, the natural order prophetic of the holy order and orders;
- (4) The modern European university with its model of laboratory as the clue to learning -- experimental, scientific, selective, research-minded;
- (5) The traditional British university with its model of leadership through humane studies as the clue to learning -- classical, philosophical, individual.

Obviously, the American college and university, in its wide diversity, reflects the heritage of each and all. What is more important for our purpose is to point out a deeper continuity in the university tradition which underlies them all, and which has only in modern time been sharply

challenged and contradicted. In its most general form, one could say, all these traditions agreed in at least three assumptions which defined the climate of the campus, accented differently, but consistent in practice. They were:

- (1) The subordination of nature
- (2) The super-animality of man
- (3) The objectivity of value

These constituted not only ordering principles but helped define the style of life, the human parentheses around the entire campus effort. My thesis, which is stated unqualified in the interest of both brevity and subsequent debate, is that the contemporary campus has so changed, that its predominate mood is the direct inversion of these classical assumptions, which gives to our campus and its students the mark of inner conflict, split personality. In short we and our campus are schizophrenic. This is illustrated not so much by what we confess, but how we act, where we spend our money, and where our final loyalty lies. The temper of our time and campus affirm in deed and discipline --

- (1) The priority of nature
- (2) The animality of man
- (3) The subjectivity of value

To be sure there are reasons for this shift, some historical, some logical, some psychological. Whatever the reasons, the fact is, the assumptions persist and are rarely challenged or brought into conscious focus in relation to the contradiction with catalogue pronouncements and cultural traditions with which they are in such radical conflict.

The impact and significance of Bombs, Babies, and Bulldozers reflects this contradiction and shift. Anxiety before the Bomb reflects the subtle sublimation of the human to the natural, albeit natural power contrived and transformed. Man's capitulation to power as arbiter of uneasy human community reflects an order of dependence never before conceded. Nature lost as partner, or even mother as with the ancient myths, becomes as slave our subtle master. We race madly as though led by ancient priestcraft, to worship at her shrine, substituting our scientific symbols for religious ones, learning our mathematical language of precision while the ancient lessons learned in the language of love lie stillborn about us.

The paradox of population explosion celebrates our emphasis on the animality of man. Here is a strange paradox. Born of our classical conviction about the super-animality of man, the sciences of medicine, nutrition, and health come of age in our time, to tend the conviction of the precious character of man. Yet the technical application of such science, without reference to real, rational or moral resources to sustain the consequence of man's animal appetite

has produced our precarious situation. Yet, who would deny that our sciences, even of man, are oriented to that reductionist logic which views man causally and linked to his past, rarely these days cosmically and linked to his future. Our campus culture reinforces the assumption, man is an animal -- to be sure with tools, language, and culture -- but we understand him best in terms of origin, not destiny.

Finally, caught in the spell of swift social change, and confronted by different and shifting standards of value, the campus has surrendered the classical assumption of the objectivity of value. Partly through confusing objective and absolute and relative and subjective, the campus has now claimed the subjective view of value. The right, the good, the true, the beautiful are not real -- given in a stubbornly cosmic sense to be discovered by any man on the same conditions. These are worlds conveying subjective satisfactions, tastes, or desires -- or at best represent cultural conventions simonized through reference to religious sanction. There is no reality to which they conform. Morality is made, not discovered. Beauty is a matter of taste, and truth, utility.

Small wonder the Bomb creates such a threat. How shall man be measured, when the classical standards of measurement turn out to be illusory, subjective? What is more important, more highly to be prized, than one's subjective desires, on such a view? What moral purpose shall direct the sex drive? What higher sanctity man's relation to neighbor? To others?

Well, how shall we deal with such contradictions or the campus confusion they engender? What patterns of cure emerge to clarify our condition? I shall mention first the cures that corrupt -- and finally those creative in promise.

III. Corrupting Cures:

Let the symbols of analysis, Bombs, Babies, and Bulldozers turn over in your mind and you will discern the cries and cures of the campus already corrupting its creativity.

Bombs express the explosive paradox of human power, the same principle creating the possibility of great good and great evil. They illustrate ingenuity, discipline, imaginative intelligence in creation, and yet pose as a precarious Frankenstein in adaptation and final use. Symbolically, one strategy as cure has won its way on campus. Ban the Bomb! Since all creative power is dangerous, let us have none of it! Translated into campus pattern, this domestication of the human spirit, a kind of spiritual disarmament, is everywhere present. Fear of explosive ideas leads to the security of mutual distrust of any test of strength. Root of much of our homogenized, mechanized, chloriformity of college campuses

lies here. Brainwashed through fear of the risk of new relationships, students settle into the status quo of the comfortable campus where the cold war between adventurous education and place-saving propaganda cancels out the creative. And, since students, on the whole, are the most dangerous and explosive element in the campus, keep him in his place, that is, fear ridden and defensive.

Babies must be fed! What better strategy than to find a cheap, easily accessible, pre-digested pabulum? And that is what we have done! We have turned the qualitative excitement of personal discovery into a mass spoon-feeding of academic pabulum. But here the analogy fails. For pabulum, at least, contains the minimal vitamins essential for the gentle diet of the child. There is little evidence, however, that academic pabulum, even pre-digested by a healthy professor gives life to the mind. Yet the solid substance of much of the general education phase of undergraduate education turns out to be just that. Here too lurks the population explosion of course fragmentation, product of a fertile and irresponsible faculty which outruns resources to keep such academic children alive.

Bulldozers are efficient, and there is a lot of mass to be moved in education. Yet the leveling of students and subject matter may simply expose bedrock on which nothing grows. Who has not watched the "big blades" scoop into large, undigested piles "History of Western Civilization," "General Science" or the like and wonder whether anything will grow. How ruthless they are with the small trees that are cut by the blade? Yet, what they do to the landscape we do to the mind. Small wonder deans get grey seeking to rescue the psychological wrecks left in the path of academic bulldozing.

But, if these are blind alleys, what are the creative patterns emerging? I do not speak of the technical transformation presented so effectively to the college presidents in January by Dr. Alvin C. Eurich, Vice President, Fund for the Advancement of Education and Mr. Harold Gores, President, Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc. Rather I refer to that stirring of students that speaks of a new creativity and changing patterns.

IV. The Creativity of the Coming Campus:

Creativity of the stirring students takes many forms:

(a) It lives in the hunger for wholeness that is forcing a new synthesis of the curricular and the co-curricular, requiring a wedding at a deeper level of teacher-counsellor-coach-advisor, and in a new demand for connection and relevance in the cafeteria of the curriculum.

(b) It lives in the demand for the integrity of a

participant in the process of learning. This has many forms, requiring a new look at the freshman year, psychological readiness, and the relation of theory and practice in the life of the campus. It rejects the sterility of neutrality in the spectator's view of scientific objectivity. It calls for a larger role of self-initiative, and the discipline of consequences in action. It calls for several radical innovations we are beginning to implement at Springfield, but not without strain:

(1) Full partnership of students in the responsibility for the educational enterprise. This means having students not only on faculty committees, but the president's cabinet and board of trustees as well.

(2) Full responsibility of students in competitive sport, where the coach sits in the stands at game time, and students conduct the contest with adequate medical counsel.

(3) Full and free appraisal of faculty by students on the art of teaching, if not the substance of subject matter.

(4) Adequate student involvement in recruiting, fund raising and development to insure a sense of the range of problems that surround his education.

(c) Creativity lives in the demand for a larger measure of solitude in developing a perspective and personal philosophy. Cultivation and conquering of inner space has become both urgent and respectable. The campus of the future will need to make more adequate provision for it.

(d) Increasingly the curriculum will reflect:

(1) Closer coordination of body-mind-spirit. This will involve new disciplines analogous to Yoga in the East as psycho-physical-spiritual exercises. These are still to be developed.

(2) New developments in communication, which will include developing non-verbal languages that link mind with body, man with the animal (especially the dolphin), mind with mind without direct contact or symbol, and man with other beings.

(3) Courses are resources and not fixed units required for graduation.

(4) Increased attention to the masculine and feminine as complementary perspectives for learning.

(5) Development of a language of value, paralleling for man what mathematics is for nature.

(e) The campus will become co-terminus with the world. This will involve such arrangements as Springfield College is entering in affiliation with the University of the Seven Seas, and more of the students experience "off campus."

(f) New methods of evaluation will be developed, placing more emphasis on motivation, value orientation, and personal commitment. An I.Q. for attitude and attitude change will be achieved.

(g) The present pace of change will become part of the fixed pattern of life, and the upgrading of faculty a permanent part of campus responsibility, linking more vitally secondary and collegiate expectation and experience.

(h) Finally, we may expect a dramatic shift in the nature of man himself. Function does earn an organ, and knowledge is a function of being. Every sign suggests that the convergence of the sciences of nature and man disclose an excitement in the exploration of inner space comparable to our present breakthroughs in outer space. We may indeed be on the threshold of another dramatic mutation in the nature of man himself. Certainly both Bombs and Babies suggest a climate of power and productivity unprecedented. Both may create the necessity and possibility of a "new creation."

In any case, we know that the clue to a creative response to Bombs, Babies, and Bulldozers are persons -- their perspective, passion, and participation in education for change.

Let, then, your leadership be in that light. See the explosive possibilities of the creative person outweighing the power of the bomb -- your faith transcending their fear. See the problem of babies, not so much in their conception, as in their transformation, the promise of their innocence not an invitation to pabulum, but the responsibility of partnership. See the Bulldozer not as a tool for teachers, but only as a limited resource for nature when help is high. See every student as a tender plant whose roots cannot survive so sharp a blade, so large a mass, and tend his natural environment and integrity as a gift of the Gods. Then, our campuses may become centers of sanity again, where nature is partner of human nature, and both akin to the Gods. (Prolonged applause)

CHAIRMAN CHENEY: Thank you very much, Dr. Olds. I am sure the response indicates the kind of message you have given us today, a very provocative one, and a very inspiring one. I wish there were time for questions because I know many in the room would have questions to raise about some of the points you have made. Thank you again for being with us today.

I have just a few announcements. Mr. Gray, of the University of Mississippi, Director of Housing, who is

President of ACUHO, is here to make a very brief announcement.

... Announcement by Mr. Malcolm Gray, President of ACUHO, regarding their next Convention scheduled to be held August 4-8, 1963 on the campus of the University of California at Los Angeles ...

MR. GRAY: I hope we can see all of you there, and we will look forward to seeing you there. I want to thank you for permitting me to come and attend your sessions. I am looking forward to being with you again.

CHAIRMAN CHENEY: We are glad to have you here.

Are there any other announcements, Carl?

SECRETARY-TREASURER KNOX: None that I know of.

CHAIRMAN CHENEY: We are adjourned.

... The Fifth General Session recessed at two-thirty o'clock ...

SEMINAR VI

Thursday Afternoon, June 27, 1963

Seminar VI, "College Placement Services", convened in Room 215, Scott Hall, at two-forty-five o'clock p.m., David Robinson, Dean of Students, Emory University, presiding.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Let's ring the bell and start to perk, gentlemen. Let me repeat, again, the subject we are going to discuss this afternoon is not college placement as such. We are going to give attention solely to the United States Employment Service participation in college placement functions.

We have a panel of four speakers, each of whom will talk from about seven to ten minutes, and I am going to time them to be sure they talk only between seven and ten minutes. After that, there will be an ample amount of time for questions.

As you have probably noticed, this panel presentation is going to be recorded, so anticipate again, if you do have questions, that you must identify yourself and your school for recording purposes.

To my immediate left is Dr. Chester E. Peters, Dean of Students, Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science. He has been in college placement work for many years. He has been expressing the view of the College Placement Council on the participation, again, of USES in the college placement field.

To my immediate right is Dr. Felician F. Foltman, of the Unemployment Insurance Service, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, of Washington, D.C. Dr. Foltman will speak from his point of view as to what USES anticipates, I presume, doing in the college placement field.

Our two other panelists are Deans of Students, each representing a campus on which USES has partial, or more, placement functions. The third speaker will be Dean Alfred R. Wolff -- to my left again -- of the Division of Student Personnel, University of Bridgeport. The anchor man will be Dean Claude J. Burtenshaw, Dean of Student Services, Utah State University.

The subject of the United States Employment Services in the college placement field has generated a lot of heat. About fourteen months ago, President Jack Clevenger asked me to chair an ad hoc committee to study the picture and make recommendations at this Conference, as a result of the Committee's findings.

A couple of weeks ago, you received the ad hoc committee report. This report, or at least the resolution resulting from the report, will be presented on the floor of the Convention tomorrow morning at nine o'clock. Although the subject of the report and the resolution, I am sure, will come up in our discussion this afternoon (for each panelist received a copy of the final report hot off the press more than a month ago), we felt it was particularly important to have the panel presentation and to solicit from members of the Convention, any comments which pertain to the committee report or the presentations this afternoon, before we go to the floor with our report tomorrow.

Because there has been a lot of negation, if you will, expressed on both sides of this issue, and at the expense of being too wishy-washy about it, I have to recall the story that Father Pat Rafferty told last night. The story has the setting in a Roman Catholic monastery. Evidently, they had presented, over many months, the value of speaking positively -- not to be critical, not to criticize, not to jump down each other's throat.

One of the young monks one night approached the dinner table and saw his plate before him and a glass of wine on the table and he picked up the glass of wine and saw in his glass a dead mouse. He shot to his feet, almost in a belligerent attitude, but remembered instantaneously this admonition which had been given for many, many weeks. When the Father in charge of the dining room, I presume, acknowledged this man on his feet, he said, "Father, the man next to me has no mouse in his glass."

Perhaps there is a subtlety here that we could keep in mind. With that, I would like to introduce Chet -- one more thought, first. Chet Peters and Dr. Foltman have presented written presentations, which they will not follow this afternoon, but their written reports will be a part of our record, to which you can give attention in future weeks, if you so choose.

Dr. Chester Peters.

DR. CHESTER E. PETERS (Dean of Students, Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science): It is a privilege for me to be here and to express the College Placement Council's views. Our views will differ -- as you will see when you read the two reports that have been submitted -- considerably. I think this is good.

We have people in the audience who have worked with the United States Employment Service on their campuses, as well as the panel, which I think is excellent and makes for a good discussion.

The College Placement Council is made up of eight

regional councils in the United States and Canada.

I want to start out by saying the basic philosophy of the Council is that the individual should have freedom in this regard, and, of course, to encourage, as much as possible, the individual utilizing his own initiative, with some help and counsel, in seeking out job opportunities, because part of the educational purpose is to enable a person to stand on his own feet. We believe that is an integral parcel and part of the educational process and should remain so. Of course, the Council feels that the college placement officers over the United States are capable and are doing a capable job and, therefore, should continue doing that.

A great amount of effort has gone into our program in the last two years through upgrading, workshops, and undertaking to find knowledge from research, and in many other areas, for continued professional development. As you will note, in this Conference here we are concerned with professional development as we are in the placement field.

This issue began in about 1961. It was first brought to the attention of the Council in April of '62. A brochure entitled "Placement of Professional Personnel" was printed. This brochure indicated that the United States Employment Service was interested in registering all college seniors and stationing USES state employment affiliates on campuses. They also indicated the employer would not be made known to the student. This was done with no contact being made with the placement officials, to the best of my knowledge, at all.

I do not know of any research that had been done ahead of time. I know Mr. Goodman has undertaken research since that time to find out what facilities were available and what was being undertaken. There was no contact made, to the best of my knowledge, with the college presidents or college placement personnel. If I am wrong, I will stand corrected on this. There was no request, of course, for assistance from the College Placement Council.

There are some universities which, for a good length of time, have had state employment programs on their campuses. There were six schools which had these programs; this has increased, to my knowledge, to a total of twenty. Reading Dr. Foltman's statement, I note he says there are forty-eight. I was not aware that it existed to this extent. I know we had six prior to this activity, and it has increased.

The Council's viewpoint is this: We feel this is a duplication of the facilities, and we feel that the United States Employment Service is a waste of the

taxpayers' money in a duplication of what is being done and done adequately. We are not, in any way, what I would term anti-employment services at all, but we are interested that this integral part of the educational process be under the colleges and universities, and that they have control of the personnel and the policies and procedures, even down to the salary levels and promotion levels and so on.

The Council is of the opinion that the money going into these services could be used more adequately to provide employment for others. It has been said by the President and the Secretary of Labor that the number one problem in the United States today is unemployment. Unemployment is not a problem in the professional area. The problem exists with the skilled, the unskilled, the high school drop-outs and in some manpower relocation problems.

We have, as you all know, the manpower retraining bill which will aid in this particular area.

The Council is also concerned about a development called "Executive listings". In other words, a firm, with the State Employment Service, would make arrangements whereby a student must be interviewed and processed through the Employment Service before he could apply for a job with that firm. This, we would hold, to be not in the best democratic manner, and this is something which concerns us a great deal.

There is, also, a concern -- and this is where they say we have made a great deal out of nothing -- about the fact that there has been a considerable effort by the Employment Service to do the recruiting, as well as having an interest in the placement. If you have control of placement on the one side and the recruiting on the other side, I think there are some problems here which are self-evident. How far this would go, I do not know, but I am definitely concerned.

The Council made contact with the Administrator of the Bureau of Employment Security for two meetings -- actually, there were three. We tried to arrange a further meeting with Secretary of Labor Wirtz, and the arrangement was made to talk with Under Secretary of Labor Henning. This is on a negative note, and the Doctor will take exception to this, I suppose, but not once have we received a communication from any of these whom I have mentioned, indicating that they would like to sit down and talk with us and work with us in this program. I have expressed, for the Council, in the letters, our desire to sit down and talk about the ways in which the United States Employment Service and its affiliates can work together with us in improving the manpower situation. I have yet to receive a communication which offers to do this.

I also have a letter which was written on June 13th to Mr. Henning, making the same offer again. I am not saying that this cannot be carried out; I am saying that we want to carry it out.

We, of course, reached an impasse in our meetings, and I think Dr. Foltman's statement will indicate this, also. We could not get a statement, or an agreement from the United States Employment Service, or higher, that college placement should be an integral part of the educational process. We will stand on that.

Let's not kid ourselves -- college placement is not without its faults, nor is any other organization. There has been a great amount of improvement in recent months and years in this particular area. The problem is a cooperative program in our area with education, with business, with government and with industry.

One of the bigger recruiting programs is carried out on campus by the United States Employment Service. A great deal of effort was made here. There was an attempt made to work with the state agency, to arrive at a reasonable degree of understanding. This was done, also, in Michigan, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, Arizona, Ohio and California. Some thought some agreement was reached, and some not. Whether we will be able to reach agreement in certain areas, I do not know.

I am concerned that in each instance, the placement people took the initiative to make the contacts and to develop this sort of a program. I am concerned about the role of a democratic government in a free society, in which I think (and I believe I speak for the Council here) it is our responsibility to do the job in placement, which we feel we are equipped to do, and when we need help, we will request help.

We are one of the few organizations that I can think of that does not have its hand out to the government saying, "Please help us to do this job, or help us to do that job." We think this is our job and this we want to do, and this we are trying to do.

There are a lot of ramifications to this. There are two sides to it. These issues are going to come out. I have a lot of other information which I will bring into the discussion as we move along. I will present the information as fairly as I can.

Any communications which I have, which has taken place between Mr. Levine, Mr. Goodwin, Mr. Kendall, Mr. Henning and Mr. Wirtz, everyone can read. You can read what they have said to me and what I have said to them, and my reports, which I have here, too. You can read some

comments which have been made on both sides, by industrial people and by others. We have had good support from our college presidents and from industry in this particular area.

Again, there are many areas in which I think the United States Employment Service, or the state employment service can provide certain areas or avenues of assistance and so forth. I think we need to sit down and talk about it. So far we have not been able to accomplish this, which, maybe, is my fault, although I do not think so, but we just have not accomplished it.

There are a lot of organizations that have gone on record in support of our position. I could read them, but time will not permit. We can go into that later. That is it -- rushed!

... The following statement was presented by Dr. Peters without reading:

The first of the Student Personnel Services was launched in 1890 with the appointment of a Dean of Men at Harvard University. Student Personnel Services grew slowly for a considerable period of time. In fact, the forerunner of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators was not founded until 1919. However, since World War II, the growth has been dramatic and many times without qualified people to fill the positions available. Highly organized student personnel groups have been the union directors, with their educational and cultural programs; the Admissions and Records Offices; a Foreign Student advisors group created because of the great influx of the international student; Religious Directors for the coordination of their efforts on college and university campuses and to serve the religious needs of the campus; the placement associations with their tremendous growth after World War II and just recently Aids & Awards officers, organizing on a regional basis.

These Student Personnel Services have grown rapidly and have organized to better execute the functions to which they address themselves. Since this panel is concerned with Placement, these comments will be restricted to this area.

Placement itself is a term which was associated primarily with teacher placement before World War II. Emphasis on professional development came in 1948 and 1949. In the three years, 1948-'51, there were established seven regional placement associations in the United States and one in Canada to develop an effective program for the assistance of the undergraduate, graduating senior and alumni of our nation's colleges and universities in all areas of academic preparation.

One of the major reasons for the rapid growth of the Placement profession has been the dedicated and capable individuals who have served their colleges and universities and their constant striving for professional development. Very few organizations can show the rapid growth and professional development in such a short time as exhibited by the Regional Placement Associations in the United States and Canada. The philosophy of placement, which has recently been formalized is basically that the placement of the graduates of a college or university should be and always remain an integral part of the educational process of that college or university. Placement in essence is the fruition of all Student Personnel Services coupled with academic preparation by assisting the graduate maximize his potential in the working society. The placement profession has dedicated time and effort to assisting each individual make maximum use of his abilities, aptitudes, and interests. The placement officers are dedicated to the concept that each individual be treated as an individual and not as a statistic.

The College Placement Council was incorporated in 1957 with three representatives (representing education, business, industry and government) from each placement association in an effort to bring about improved professionalization and cooperation between business, industry, education and government. The Council publishes the College Placement Annual which is distributed to graduating seniors and graduate students throughout the United States, used extensively in libraries, university offices, Armed Services units, and many other areas as an excellent source of employment opportunities. The Council also publishes a Journal of College Placement which has received recognition as an outstanding publication. Also, the Council has published a book, The Fundamentals of College Placement, developed a philosophy of placement, and worked jointly with the United States Chamber of Commerce and professional societies in the development of the "principles and practices" of college recruiting. Because of the tremendous interest of business, governmental, educational, and industrial organizations in locating the educated and talented young people of today, professional placement people have had to develop effective programs of action.

There has been some recent conflicts in placement philosophy. These conflicts were pinpointed by the April, 1962, publication by the Bureau of Employment Security of a brochure entitled "Placement of Professional Personnel." This publication outlined the "new" United States Employment Service professional placement program and set forth the idea that the USES should be the manpower center for the United States. This publication was followed by a talk to the Midwest College Placement Association in May by the director of the United States Employment Service. The professional placement people of this association were told

by the director that they were incompetent, incapable and unqualified to handle the task of assisting the young college students in career determination and in assisting in effective manpower utilization.

The United States Employment Service stated in April, 1962, that they planned to register all college seniors and to become the manpower center of the United States. They wanted to assist the college graduate but would not identify the employing firm for whom they were filling orders. It is extremely difficult to have any effective counseling and placement program if the organization offering the opportunity conceals its background, history, and organization and the utilization of the potential of its employees. An effective placement program means career placement, not job-getting. Secrecy is not an asset in any profession and most certainly not in the placement area.

The professional people of the College Placement Council and the Regional Associations felt that they could not stand by and allow a disruption and denial of the philosophy of college placement by a third party. As a result a committee was appointed to study the problem and present a recommendation for action. While the preliminary studies were being made, the United States Employment Service increased its on-campus placement activity from six schools which have had established USES facilities for a length of time to a total of nineteen colleges and universities with part or full time USES personnel. This number has risen to at least twenty at the present time. Not only has the United States Employment Service and some of its state affiliates been desirous of registering and placing the college graduates but they have been aggressively seeking to perform the functions of recruiting for business and industrial firms. Such a program would enable the USES and their affiliates to handle both ends of the manpower problem giving their organization maximum control of manpower allocation. Their main argument for assuming the recruiting functions was their assumption that the placement directors give very little attention to the small business or industrial firm. Nothing could be further from the truth as undoubtedly more time and effort is given to the small firm with individual needs than to the large firm with more numerous opportunities.

The officers of the College Placement Council endeavored to bring the problem to the proper authorities in Washington in an effort to have open discussions and arrive at an acceptable solution. Four times College Placement officers met with members of the Department of Labor including the Director of the United States Employment Service, the Administrator of the Bureau of Employment Security and the Under Secretary of Labor in charge of manpower for the United States. A meeting of the minds

was not forthcoming and the Department of Labor was not willing to accept the philosophy of the College Placement Council. Basically, this philosophy is that College Placement is an integral part of the educational process and should remain under the administration and jurisdiction of the college or university. However, there has been a re-issue of the April, 1962, bulletin which indicated that the Department of Labor would endeavor to work more closely with the colleges and universities but still holds to the conviction to the right to establish employment service facilities on campuses.

The College Placement Council feels that there is no need for additional employment service assistance for the college graduate. The great need, which has been expounded by the President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, many people in the Department of Labor and by many others, is to assist the unemployed. These are the individuals who drop out of high school, other young people who are not equipped and qualified to perform needed tasks and displacements caused by automation. Also, the unemployment of the skilled and unskilled worker is a major problem of the Department of Labor. Unemployment of the professional or higher educated young man or woman who has the ability and the capacity to compete adequately in our society is not and has not been a placement problem. It has been felt by the Council that the United States Employment Service and the Department of Labor have taken the attitude, "If you think there is a problem, you come to us." The Council has never received a communication from the USES or Department of Labor indicating their desire to assist in improving the professional placement program. Perhaps the conflict of interests between the USES and CPC has arisen because for the first time an organization has asked the government to let them do the job they are equipped to do and have been performing rather than asking government to bail them out.

One of the very positive results of this conflict of interest and philosophy between the government services and the educational services is that the Council has been able to develop an improved and more positive program in the placement field. A statement of reciprocity was written and agreed upon by the Council in an effort to assist those graduates from other schools who may be moving from one section of the country to another. Regional advisory committees have been established in various placement associations to assist in the upgrading of the placement offices and in the establishment of new placement offices. There has been an upgrading of professional personnel through meetings and effective regional workshops. Research is being supported in an aggressive manner by the Council. The various publications mentioned earlier in this statement have been of great value in the CPC positive placement program.

The College Placement Council will work diligently to keep the placement profession an integral part of the educational process of an institution. It feels very strongly that the individual should have the freedom to seek out the opportunity he desires and to make maximum use of his own initiative in his career programming. The Council is continuing to explore every possible avenue to develop a cooperative program with the Department of Labor which will allow the Council to support its own philosophy and to assist in the maximum utilization of our educated manpower. Placement is a young profession, dedicated and capable, and has a very important role in Student Personnel Service programs which encompass the entire educational years of the student and carry into his adult working years. The Council has obtained support of its position from the various professional associations, educational institutions, government organizations, business and industry. These statements have endorsed the idea that the task of the governmental employment services lies in the area of the unemployed where it is greatly needed and not in the area of professional manpower allocation. ...

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I appreciate that. We will have time to discuss this in more detail later.

Dr. Foltman, we appreciate your coming into this den of deans. May we ask you to present your remarks.

DR. FELICIAN F. FOLTMAN (Unemployment Insurance Service, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security): I would like to remind the audience that I have copies of my address. I am not going to read it. I will speak off the cuff very, very briefly, so as to have more time for the discussion period. I do hope that some of you will read it now, rather than months later, or weeks later.

I am happy to have been invited here, with Dr. Peters and others, to participate in these deliberations. I have a little bit of the feeling of a Roman gladiator -- you know, thumbs up or thumbs down, in the sense that you people already have a resolution which is going before your assembly tomorrow morning. I was very interested to note this: When the original correspondence came in from Mr. Robinson, your Committee had done its home work all year long, and you were then prepared to say, "USES, go home", or something like that.

It seems to me that this is a very, very important issue, as Dr. Peters has indicated. I would like to introduce my remarks with a couple of miscellaneous comments. First of all, I would like to suggest that we all keep very, very clearly in mind, whenever we talk about USES, that this is one of the more complicated programs that we have. It is a Federal-State program and one of the more complicated governmental programs.

To begin with, each of the fifty States -- actually, there are fifty-four jurisdictions, when you include the Virgin Islands and that sort of thing -- each of the fifty-four jurisdictions has their own state unemployment service. The people who work for that unemployment service are state employees. They are on the state payroll. For example, here in Illinois, they are on the Illinois State payroll, and the same is true in Iowa, Utah, or whatever State it may be.

It is, also, a Federal program in the sense that the National Government provides leadership and provides the guidelines for the programs in the state, and, also, and most important of course, the moneys for the operation of the programs, which come via the Federal Government. Various taxes are collected in the states, sent to Washington, and from Washington, they are sent back to the states.

I want you to be clear on this fact: This is not administered completely, if you will, directly out of Washington. It is a very, very complicated, if you will, administrative relationship, whereby Mr. Goodwin, the administrator of the BES, has working for him Mr. Levine, Director of the U.S. Employment Service. Mr. Levine works for a complicated regional set-up. There are twelve regions throughout the country and these people, in turn, work on a state relationship. This just indicates that this is a complicated administrative thing which we are talking about. When we are talking about policy in placement, or any aspect of the manpower problem, we have to be concerned with this structure, this blueprint, if you will, for getting things done.

Another point I would like to emphasize very, very strongly before we get into the question of the future, is the fact that more and more in the United States, in our industrialized economy, more and more of us are becoming employees. Therefore, this placement relationship, or this placement process, in which, I presume, all of us have a very keen interest this afternoon, is very, very important. We are employed more and more. Some people have figured, or calculated, that as many as ninety plus per cent of us in America today are on somebody's payroll. The business of getting a job is tremendously important.

From my own personal point of view, I think it is very desirable, in connection with any job hunting, that we have, in America, a public and a private procedure for selecting, finding and eventually getting jobs. I think it is very, very desirable that there be both a private and public apparatus, if you will, or programs, and good ones, in both cases. I do not think either one should be slighted.

Finally, I would like to suggest, from my own personal point of view, that we keep in mind this premise:

There should be no compulsion on anyone, and that the individual, in any job hunting or placement, should make up his own mind, and the ultimate choice should be his to make. I wanted to make sure we are clear on that.

Now just a few words about the USES role as it has developed and is developing, and Dr. Peters and his colleagues are quite concerned about some of these developments. As Uncle Sam sees it, from the point of view of people who work in Washington (these are the technicians, if you will -- the people planning and trying to develop the total program) -- as they look at it and have been looking at it for some time, these things become relevant to them: First of all, the categories of manpower called professional, managerial and technical, by any definition, are becoming more and more important. More and more of us work in these categories and more and more are we becoming a bigger total of the total labor force. People going into these occupations, obviously, are important.

It is, also, important to remember that in any evolution of a manpower policy in Washington, a number of things have happened over the years. I think we have to keep this history in mind if we are to understand the current situation and if we are to understand where we are going in this country.

To begin with, we have no total, concerted or systematic manpower policy in America. We have a whole series of bits and pieces which have been evolving over the years. For our purpose here this afternoon, the relevant bits and pieces are these: The Wagner-Peyser Act, which is a New Deal Act, provides, basically, for a system of public employment offices. We have, beyond that, another very, very important bit of legislation, enacted right after World War II, called the Employment Act of 1946. This is most important in our history, because for the first time, this legislation says, "We now will try to plan and structure and be concerned about our total economy, and as one important part of it, we will be concerned about our manpower." The Employment Act of '46, if you will, begins to implement some of the New Deal legislation, including the Wagner-Peyser Act.

We also have the Area Redevelopment Act, the Retraining Act, and the current suggestions being made in Washington in the manpower field. We have a number of suggestions being considered. What I am trying to suggest is the manpower policies we have for the nation are in the process of being evolved or are evolving. We do not have one master plan. We have a host of things that have happened over the years, and we are in the process now of developing a plan as we go along.

As Dr. Peters indicated, and I would like to make this point again, it is also important to recognize in the

1960s, that when the Kennedy administration took over in Washington, they made, as a high priority of business, the manpower questions, or the manpower processes overall. In connection with that, the President has said in various places, at various times and in various ways, that there should be a strengthening of public unemployment services, and, specifically, this service should be strengthened with respect to the things it does for you, including drop-outs of one kind and another and including college youths.

Obviously, with this kind of mandate, the people in Washington, who work for USES -- the planners, the technicians -- felt there should be an expanded and improved service in the states, and specifically, somehow, they should relate themselves somehow to college campuses, and so there began this activity, if you will, on the college campuses, which is quite recent.

I would like to give you the data that Dr. Peters has already referred to. We, in Washington, have been very, very concerned in answering the same question that Dr. Peters is trying to answer, and that, I presume, many of you are interested in, too, to-wit, just exactly how many public employment people in what states are involved on what campuses, and that kind of thing. I do not know that anyone in this room or elsewhere really has the final definitive data on this. I do not know that the surveys we have been making, either from your point of view, from Dr. Peters' or ours, are good enough. We have, however, as of two weeks ago -- I have been out of town myself for two weeks -- as of two weeks ago, it was calculated, in terms of the various reports we have been getting in Washington, that of 2,008 colleges and universities in this country, public employment services were provided on campus in forty-eight instances.

I go on to say, in my prepared presentation: "This is 2.3 per cent of the total; in twenty-three of these" -- of the forty-eight now -- "service is provided full-time for nine or twelve months." Perhaps that is the figure you have. In the remainder -- between this and the forty-eight now -- service is provided for something less than full time. In some cases, there is only a very, very occasional or rare visit, to give a talk on campus or that sort of thing. So from this point of view -- our point of view -- it seems to me that placement services on campus, by the public employment people, are, by any definition, very, very limited, I would say.

I would like to very, very briefly comment -- do I have to stop now? -- on just a couple of things, just to indicate that I do concur wholeheartedly with Dr. Peters in that we have an agreement to disagree. I would like to comment on some things that he has mentioned and some others that I think should be mentioned.

There are misconceptions about this, if you will, or some statements being made that are non-factual. I think some people have been saying things about this, which should be cleared up. I will cite some of these and then hold the rest for our discussion period, if you want to get into more of them. For example, when it is said, "Tax moneys are being dissipated to provide unneeded and unsought assistance by state employment services to graduating college students", I think as it stands, that is untrue. This has been said in writing and in many quarters, and I think it is untrue and unfair, because the public employment people, wherever they may be, cannot force themselves onto your campuses. Let's not kid ourselves; they have to be invited. They have to be sponsored somehow by someone.

I think it is a little bit unfair and unnecessary to say "unneeded and unsought." You can say "unneeded" from your point of view, perhaps, but I think we should make it clear that they are there only at someone's invitation. After all, they do not come in with clubs and fight their way onto the campus.

Another example of what I think is untrue and unfair is this statement: "With almost negligible exceptions, colleges and universities are providing services necessary to help graduates enter our economy." I do not think this is true, because formal placement activity has not been established in many, many institutions of higher learning in this country, unfortunately. There are many, many junior colleges and many full-fledged four-year colleges which do not have placement offices. They cannot afford them, and so it is unfair to say that colleges and universities are providing these services, and, in effect, argue that no additional help is needed.

Finally -- and I will stop with this one, although there are some others -- this is a very, very serious charge that is being made: "The USES college placement program will eventually lead to a central federal manpower agency which will arbitrarily assign professional people to jobs." This is a bogeyman if ever there was one. This kind of a charge is not doing anybody any real favor. I think it is doing your organization and persons who mouth this kind of charge a real disservice. It is not true. It is not practical and I do not think it could be practical in this day and age, and it is the kind of emotion-laden message that should not be used by professional people in an examination of a proposition that is exceedingly important, to-wit, the whole question of helping college people enter upon professional careers.

Just a couple of points in summary: I am only a consultant. I am a professor at Cornell and I am working as a consultant to this organization. I am going back in the middle of August. From my point of view, I feel, as

an individual, that the United States Employment Service will continue, in a state-federal partnership, to implement legislative and administrative mandates, and will provide public employment services to anybody who is interested in such services. That includes, quite specifically, college people.

I do not think that the USES is taking over college placement. I do not think it could if it wanted to. It is not smart enough to do that, and I do not think it has that kind of motivation. I think it is a disservice to everyone to claim or think that it has that kind of motivation. I think, as I said before, that our economy is such that professional manpower and technical manpower is exceedingly important and will continue to be in short supply and continue to be important, and I think it will require, finally, the best efforts of everybody, public people in public programs and private people in private programs, to make sure that persons who are trained and qualified get into their proper niche, and find their proper niche, wherever that may be.

From my point of view, I say, by all means, let's continue the dialogue and let's continue to try to find some kind of cooperative relationships. I do emphasize, however, "cooperative" -- not one-sided and not to the exclusion of one or the other, but "cooperative".

... The following statement entitled "USES Role in College Placement - Facts, Myths and the Future", was presented by Dr. Foltman without reading:

In the last year or two some college placement officials, Chamber of Commerce officials, representatives of business and industry have evidenced considerable misunderstanding of the college campus placement activity of the USES. By dint of earnest efforts some college placement officials have succeeded in having their viewpoint publicized in magazines like Nation's Business, and as a further result of their efforts, these college placement officials have testified before Congressional Committees, met with officials of the Department of Labor and have managed somehow to convince themselves that they are waging a crusade against unnecessary and unwarranted interference by big government. To my mind, this situation has an Alice in Wonderland quality to it when viewed against the total needs of students, college institutions, and the public interest. Unfortunately, instead of cooperative effort to provide even more effective placement services to college youth, the USES finds itself the subject of attack. And, as in any contest, the contestants are too busy attacking or defending to worry about bystanders.

But do not misunderstand me. The College Placement Council is aggrieved and it has, very properly, taken

advantage of a basic American right to inform one and all of its complaint. My purpose here is to explore with you some of the myths, some of the facts, and what all this portends for the future. My hope is that these additional data will help you to reach intelligent conclusions about our public policy -- conclusions based more on actual fact rather than hope or ideology. So let's review the facts and see what these facts tell us.

The Public Employment Service Perception of Professional Manpower Needs

As one of the government services charged by law with responsibility for facilitating optimum use of our human resources, the USES has been and always will be concerned with the labor market utilization of college graduates. Given the fact that professional occupations are becoming more important, more indispensable to the operation of our economy, it would seem only prudent that government manpower services devote more time, attention and money to this segment of our labor force. The Nation's professional manpower receives its fundamental preparation in our Nation's educational institutions. If our professional manpower is inadequate either in terms of quantity, or location, it follows that national productivity will suffer. It is, therefore, in the public interest that the USES seeks to help place college graduates in positions in which they can make a maximum contribution to the Nation's economy while realizing their own individual goals. But, one may ask, who defines what is or is not in the public interest? According to some of the critics the USES is unilaterally defining the public interest, and not too well according to these same critics. It is increasingly clear, however, that manpower development and utilization is so much in the public interest that the Nation is evolving a legal framework to spell out national policies. From Wagner-Peyser to Employment Act to MDTA, the national public interest in developing and conserving our precious human resources has ever more clearly been defined. If we can empathize for a moment from the government view, we see professional manpower as an expanding part of our work force, both quantitatively and qualitatively; we are witness to a slow but steady evolution of federal public policy which specifies that we must make more effective use of manpower; and, finally, we are told by President Kennedy soon after he took office in 1961 that we must expand and improve our services to all but most specifically for youth including college dropouts.

Thus far, we have reviewed public employment service views of college placement from the broad policy perspective which is for many of us a little esoteric. Let us now visualize things from a student's point of view. Some students, first of all, in some colleges are swamped with interesting and financially rewarding job offers. What

these students need are some valid criteria for judging and then deciding which of the job offers they should accept. All of us have heard this rather plaintive question from college students -- "Which of these offers should I take, Professor?" But for every university student who has a surfeit of offers, there is another university student who has none. For this student, typically an arts student and more frequently than not a female, not too much is being done. This is not to say that college officials are unwilling. It is to say that students with broad general training have more difficulty finding entry jobs for which they qualify. Paradoxically, however, many employers still talk about recruiting the well-rounded, broadly educated person but their recruiters, more often than not, are recruiting for rather narrowly conceived specialists. All students, whether or not they have firm job offers, should have: Up-to-date and realistic information about jobs and labor markets; full information about employers; valid criteria for evaluating job offers; and whatever other information, help and support that may be necessary for prompt and easy entry into their chosen field of endeavor. Are students getting this level of service? What will be necessary to provide an acceptable level of service? It doesn't take extraordinary prescience to recognize that these are real student needs and that the best efforts of private and public agencies working in concert would only begin to meet these needs.

Finally, the public employment service perceives that collegiate level institutions would like additional assistance in placing its graduates or for those who for one reason or another left college -- the college dropout. Contrary to what some people believe, this conclusion was not arrived at by gazing into a crystal ball. In the heyday of the "GI Bill", when schools were crowded with veterans, some schools requested placement assistance from public employment offices. Placement services were requested both to help students obtain part-time jobs and also to help them to commence upon careers after graduation. It is interesting, as an historical footnote, to note that the original plans for the provision of some public employment services to schools and colleges were developed in cooperation with the American Council of Education's Committee on Relationship of Higher Education to the Federal Government.

The need to provide additional counseling and placement services to our future professionals, that is our junior college and college level students, seems to be quite evident. Public employment service personnel have no alternative except to try to provide some service to our young people who are about to begin their careers. If the foregoing rationale is not sufficiently convincing, however, one only has to turn to President Kennedy's first economic message in which he directed the Secretary of Labor to take steps to provide better service through

public employment offices to all job seekers, but specifically for job seekers recently graduated from colleges and high schools.

The Program to Meet "College Placement" Needs

In the face of tremendous need public employment service assistance to college level institutions is, by any definition, much too little. To date very few resources, men or money, have been allocated to this particular area of need but I, for one, believe that there should be more rather than less state employment service assistance to our future professional manpower. Despite the modesty of the programs, a number of individuals and organizations seem to be very concerned that the State Employment Services are providing unneeded and unsought assistance to graduating college students. What are these programs that seem to stimulate some people so?

Of 2,008 colleges and universities in this country, public employment services provide on-campus service to only forty-eight. This is 2.3 per cent of the total; in twenty-three of these (1.1 per cent) service is provided full-time for nine or twelve months; in the others, service is provided for short periods of time. In 1962, it is estimated that there were 3,860,643 students; of this group, public employment services were provided to 26,921, or .7 per cent. Services included placement in part-time or permanent jobs; registration and counseling for employment or providing labor market information. And these are the on-campus services that threaten to create "professional manpower control"!

In twenty-nine of the forty-eight schools just cited, there was no college placement service prior to the arrangements under discussion. In the remaining eighteen, there is a college placement unit in the school which works cooperatively with public employment personnel. As these figures indicate, USES services may range from just a simple exchange of information to occasional participation in on-campus activity to provision of placement services on the college campus, but only at the invitation of the school.

One of the public employment service programs for college youth merits some additional explanation here because it so clearly demonstrates the type of mutually profitable cooperation that can be achieved when intelligent and well-meaning people get together. The program is conducted by the Career Planning Unit of the N.Y.S.E.S. in New York City for liberal arts graduates, college graduates who do not have well defined career goals and college drop-outs. Several employment service counselors in the Professional Placement Center of the New York City employment office have been assigned to work with these special groups.

What these counselors have done is to concentrate on these special groups by going to college campuses to interview liberal arts students (Colgate, Cornell, Russel Sage, Skidmore, Syracuse in N.Y. State in 1962); to prepare occupational and placement literature especially designed for them; and to set up a unit in N.Y.C. to which these students are referred and where they receive tailor-made services.

A total of 7,024 new applications of professional beginners were taken in 1962 by the Career Planning Unit. A special study of the 1,339 liberal arts college graduates interviewed by the unit from January through September, 1962 showed that these graduates came from 303 different educational institutions in forty-five states, Washington, D.C., Puerto Rico, and many foreign countries. 571 were from New York City colleges. Sixty-five per cent were 1962 graduates and thirty-five per cent represented graduates of earlier years who had less than six months of professional experience.

On-campus or local office placement services are but phases of a broad USES-State program. Another important contribution to improved professional manpower utilization is the convention placement service which is provided for national professional organizations. This is a relatively new service to help employer and job applicant get together during professional association conventions. More and more organizations like the National Conference on Social Welfare, American Economic Association, American Pharmaceutical Association are discovering that their "markets" can be efficiently and equitably administered for them by the National Network of Public Employment Offices which can pre-register applicants and accept employer orders before the convention so that less time is wasted during the convention.

It should be emphasized, finally, that services to students or to institutions of higher learning are local and national. Local services have already been at least partially described; national services include, among other things, provision for inter-area (regional or national) clearance service for any applicant. In this arrangement, the USES has linked 122 professional offices onto a nationwide professional office network so that job hunting becomes truly national in scope. This nationwide service will be even more valuable if the pilot project in electronic data processing and communication of jobs and applicants proves successful. Preliminary indications from California (regular employment offices are linked in a network and from Washington State employment teacher placement services are being computerized) are that there are no insurmountable obstacles in these newer systems approaches.

Assistance to colleges, junior colleges and students of these institutions include regular local office services; part-time or full-time on-campus services; both of which are an integral part of national systems already in existence or under development. The policy has been and is to supplement not to supplant; to help, not to hinder; to cooperate, not to fight; and, thus, to help develop, conserve and utilize precious human resources. But now we return to the Alice in Wonderland part of this when we look at some of the myth and fantasy which is being disseminated about these matters.

Current Myth, Shibboleth and Charge

Just about one year ago there appeared in a journal published by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce (Nation's Business) an article entitled "USES Moves In on Colleges." The publication of the article marked the beginning of an aggressive campaign led by officials of the College Placement Council to force the public employment service withdrawal from all service to college students. Let's review the charges and the specifications.

Officials of the College Placement Council, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, some managers of business organizations, and some of their friends allege that:

1. State Employment Service on-campus service is unnecessary; that college placement officers can meet the needs adequately.
2. Expansion of college placement activity by the public employment service poses a threat to the very existence of institutionally supported placement offices.
3. USES activity will eventually lead to centralized federal control over the allocation of professional and technical manpower.

Is there merit in these allegations? Is there a real probability that the charges are true or tending to become true? Unequivocally no, although it is true that some employment service personnel did not always approach their responsibilities in this area in a truly professional manner.

Because the charges are very serious, because the stakes are important, and because it is essential that misunderstandings be cleared up, it is imperative that we dig a little deeper into the specifics of this aggressive effort to limit public employment services. Here are some of the myths and factual responses in each case.

Myth - Tax moneys are being dissipated to provide unneeded and unsought assistance by state employment services to graduating college students.

As already indicated, these services are needed, wanted, sought and given. With regard to where services are performed, they are overwhelmingly provided in the regular State Employment Service local offices. In only a few instances is service given on the college campus and then only at the invitation of the institution. Distance from the local employment offices is sometimes an important element in determining whether there is a need for campus service.

Myth - With almost negligible exceptions, colleges and universities are providing services necessary to help graduates enter our economy.

It is true that many large universities offer good placement services; it is equally true that hundreds of small colleges and many hundreds of junior colleges provide no placement services. Moreover, not even the large university is equipped to collect and publish labor market information.

According to the figures quoted by Dr. Peters in his presentation during the hearings of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education and Welfare of the House on appropriations, March 27, 1963, only 853 of the 1,085 accredited four-year-degree-granting institutions of higher learning have "formalized" placement activity. It would seem, then, the remaining 232 four-year colleges, plus the 670 accredited odd junior colleges throughout the country are not provided placement services by college placement officers.

Myth - The USES college placement program will eventually lead to a central federal manpower agency which will arbitrarily assign professional people to jobs.

Under our Federal-State cooperative system of public employment service, each State develops and operates its service in accordance with the needs of the applicants, the employers, the educational institutions, and the labor market, within the broad framework of existing State and Federal laws and policies. Because of this system, centralized federal control of services to college students, or to any other applicant group, is not possible. All services provided through the public employment service network are provided by the State agencies.

That the public employment service desires or, indeed, is in a position to arbitrarily assign manpower to jobs is a contention not based in fact. First, use of the services is strictly voluntary both on the part of the applicant and of the employer. Second, choosing to use the service in no way implies that an employer must hire an applicant that is referred to him, nor that the applicant must accept the job if it is offered. The public

employment service cannot influence their decisions, nor does it desire to interfere in them.

Myth - The USES is attempting to establish a system whereby electronic data computers will match, by statistical means, professional job applicants and job openings.

Misinterpretation of the experiment conducted by some of the state agencies into the use of electronic equipment probably gave rise to this allegation. The experiment is nothing more than an attempt to speed-up the process of preliminary matching job orders in one part of the country with job applications in another. The final matching will always require human judgment; it cannot be done by computers. Again, matching does not constitute hiring. Only the employer can hire; only the applicant can accept.

Myth - On-campus service by the USES constitutes undue interference between industrial recruiters and college graduates.

The public employment service has no intention of interfering with any established college recruitment program in any firm. Although large firms with extensive recruiting facilities may not require assistance in college recruitment, smaller firms that hire perhaps only two or three graduates a year, however, often do need and request public employment services.

Myth - Employment service representatives conduct on-campus recruitment but refuse to disclose the name of the employer to the college placement officer.

When on-campus services are provided by employment service representatives to assist college placement officers, job order information, including the identity of the employer, is shared. Only at the request of the employer would his identity, or that of his firm, be withheld.

Myth - The USES proposes to register all college seniors not to help students but to swell its workload and justify even larger budget allocations.

This is neither practical nor, if practical, very desirable from any point of view. College students may elect, like any other applicant, to use public employment services. In choosing to register with public as well as private employment services, college students are realistically broadening their job horizons.

Prospect

I have presented in this paper the story of college placement developments as seen by an outsider -- albeit

a friendly neutral to the USES. What the USES has seen as a small scale but useful activity to provide more service for our most important group, new or potential professionals, the C.P.C. sees as a threat to its very existence. I then set forth the charges and answers to those charges.

What does all this imply? It implies that public employment services will continue to serve, as they have in the past; when, as and where needed in compliance with legislative mandates. It must be apparent that recent charges that the E.S. is forcing itself upon college campuses are just not true. Even if the Employment Services really wanted to force itself upon college campuses, it could not, due to our present laws and traditions. Charges alleging that a State-Federal employment service is attempting to control manpower are irresponsible to put the matter kindly.

The C.P.C. is right in at least one respect -- there has been a failure of communication between the Council and the public employment services. But communications between these organizations will continue to be futile as long as the C.P.C. insists that it has the total solution to our professional manpower problems. If instead of insisting on exclusive jurisdiction, the C.P.C. could find time to explore, mutually and constructively, student needs there would be little time for fruitless discussion of autonomy or jurisdiction. By the same token, public employment service officers do not meet their manpower responsibilities by even implying that they and they alone should do the job. To the extent that this has happened, it is to be hoped that they have learned from recent experiences.

Innovation of any kind in any context is bound to produce reactions. Recent experiences on college campuses seem to verify the essential truth of this cliché. Now that all parties have had ample opportunity to demonstrate and present their points of view, perhaps it is time to remind both parties that the job is much too big for both of you. Since this is true it is time to stop the dialogue and time to go back to work in the real public interest. ...

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Let's continue the dialogue. Dean Wolff represents a campus where there are some services contributed to the functioning of the University by the USES. In communication with him, we have found there is a level of satisfaction he has achieved in this relationship. Let's turn to Dean Wolff, and may I ask that you be as brief as you can so that there will be time for questions and answers.

DEAN ALFRED R. WOLFF (Dean of Student Personnel, University of Bridgeport): About five months ago I was sorting the mail on my desk -- there was a letter from a

parent who objected to the noise in a dormitory (her son was the chief trouble-maker); a memo from a faculty member complaining about a student who was asking too many questions in class and the instructor felt it was because he wanted to embarrass the professor; an invitation to a faculty-student tea, to, of course, improve faculty relationships; and a letter from Dean Dave Robinson, asking me what I thought of the Employment Service association with our College Placement Service at the University of Bridgeport.

I thought my answers to all these letters would have little significance a few months later; I guess that is where I was wrong. I wrote Dean Robinson and told him I was very pleased with the association of the State Employment Service with the University of Bridgeport placement office, and now, instead of on a camping trip to Montana, I am here in the hot sun in Evanston. (Laughter)

I had no idea about the controversy that there seems to be over this -- not until three or four months ago. I have not traveled from Bridgeport, Connecticut, to Evanston to save your souls and to make you accept the State Employment Service in your college. I think if placement officers are opposed to working with the State Employment office and believe they can do without this association, this should be allowed. Frankly, I would not want anyone telling the University of Bridgeport that we had to have the State Employment Service. I must admit, in all frankness, also, that I am not quite sure I appreciate being told that perhaps the University of Bridgeport should not have the association with the State Employment Service. I believe there should be a freedom of choice.

The point is that the University of Bridgeport is not forced to have this relationship with the State Employment Service. We can terminate our contract with the State any time we want to after one year without any problem. This is our choice. We happen to like it so we are not going to terminate it.

I was delighted when I heard two years ago that a man from the State Employment Service was going to work in the Placement Office, which is just above the floor on which I happen to work. Our placement man -- we only have one -- wears many hats. He has worn himself very thin. He spends the majority of his time setting up training programs. He should spend more time on placement, but he can not, and there was no provision in the budget whereby he can spend more time on placement.

When the State Employment Service came to us, we believed we were going to have, and we do have, the services of an expert, who had a tremendous network of interstate referrals available to our graduates. Listings of

job opportunities all over the country were made available to us because of him.

I am a student personnel man, and, I hope, a professional one. I want my students to utilize their talents to the fullest. I want them placed in positions where this will happen, and I want to see them advance. I intend to use every legitimate source whereby I can achieve this particular goal. I welcome help. I welcomed the USES and State Employment Service, and I have had no reason to regret it.

In my philosophy, the personal needs of each student should not be served exclusively by a group of specialists in a school administrative office, a student personnel office, or a counseling service. We have a need to join forces with everyone interested, willing and able to make a real and important contribution to aid our students in their adjustment. This includes a faculty member who has occupational information or the ability to just plain listen; the businessman in the community who can speak of his experiences; the counselor in my office, and the placement specialist from the State Employment office.

It is a tremendous savings to our students to have the State Employment Service office just above my own office. The State Employment Service office is located, actually, a half-hour away by bus -- a twenty-five cent bus fare.

When a student goes to the State Employment Service office in my building, located on the floor above our counseling office, and there are any problems, coordination can and usually does take place, if needed. They refer the student back and forth, if need be; they are working together to help the student. We find, I repeat, that this is a very happy arrangement.

I promised you I would make no attempt to save your soul. I feel, frankly, that this cannot be done, even if I wanted to do this, but I find myself becoming rather positive. I want to tell you why it has worked out at the University of Bridgeport. I cannot tell you that it will work at the University of Utah, or Washington, or what-have-you. I am just stating that at the University of Bridgeport it happens to work, and I will tell you why.

In the first place, the personnel we have had have been fine. They have been very competent. The first man was a psychologist; the second man has his degree in counseling. They have worked as part of the team.

The second point I want to make is they have a tremendous source of occupational information that many of us who are not specialists do not have. When my counselors

are working with students, and they want to tell them about some government jobs, they can go to the files that are right upstairs. The man there has much information about these jobs and we use him.

Part of the university placement job, and ours, also, is dismissing students for poor grades. This is an uncomfortable job. I might have a student who will leave the university for a year or two. I want to help him, if he is willing to be placed in a productive service job. The State Employment Service knows what I want, and that man can help the student get a useful and worth-while job for a year or two-year period. This, I think, is very important.

We have worked cooperatively with the State Employment Service. A counselor from my office and the State Employment Service man have sat, at the University of Bridgeport, around a table. They have lists of material with regard to similar opportunities for educational experiences and job opportunities. They work together. There is no divisive feeling whatsoever.

I have used the State Employment Service man with regard to Career Day. He has a lot of knowledge and is helpful then. They have helped to find jobs for our students. In 1962-'63, they placed about a hundred of our students in full-time jobs, and about eighty in part-time jobs.

They have actually helped the University find employees; they have helped us to find maintenance people, and, as a matter of fact, they helped me find an administrative assistant, and they did not make me take that person -- it was my choice. Let's face it, this association has been most beneficial to the University of Bridgeport.

I want to talk for one or two more minutes. I am sure those of you who are present and who oppose the association of the State Employment Service and the college placement office, voice your opposition because you believe it is wrong for the students. I will tell you, however, that in most of the arguments of the opposition which I have heard, I have never even heard the word "students" mentioned. No one is worried about the students. They have said, "I have heard that the USES is taking on the job of the private agencies, and there will be no need for the private placement agencies." No one is saying anything about the students. I am not talking about your motivation now, but I say the fuss I have heard is not concerned with whether it is good for the student, but whether it is good for somebody else, and that does not concern me very much.

I am told back in 1937, the placement people at that time voiced opposition to the USES, because the USES

came into existence at that time. I believe there is still room for the USES and private placement agencies. Few will deny that the USES has helped the employment picture and not eliminated the private agency.

I have read some material stating that this whole idea is contrary to our private enterprise system. Over the years I have heard this generalization used too often to block important help to people, and I refuse to be scared by this statement. I have heard, with regard to legislation which would help people, that it is an invasion of private rights. I say, frankly, if it is important, let's have it.

I repeat, I believe it is an important obligation of college student personnel workers to help our students get placed in positions where their abilities can be used to the maximum and, hopefully, that they will enjoy what they are doing. I think it is, also, to the nation's advantage to use our people to the maximum and place them as well as possible. It is important for our national economy that we assist in every way the employers to find the people with skills, who are in short supply.

Let's not join the psychiatrists who would exclude clinical psychologists from everything but testing, and the other groups, which somehow appear to have vested interests which they are fighting to preserve. Let's instead welcome the state placement people to our campuses and include them as part of the team working for the best interests of the students. If you do not want to do this, at least do not interfere with the legitimate right of the University of Bridgeport to have this privilege and opportunity.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Claude Burtenshaw of the University of Utah also has the USES on the campus. May we have your thoughts on the subject, Claude?

DEAN CLAUDE J. BURTENSHAW (Dean of Student Services, Utah State University): I think what I wanted to say has already been said.

I think I should describe our University and its setting to let you see the development of this service on our campus. Our school is in a town of about 20,000. We are about fifty miles from an industrial center, and about a hundred miles from even a larger one. We are largely a rural agricultural community. We have about 6,000 students who come from about -- well, two-thirds of them from within the State of Utah and one-third of them from without the State. The area from where they come is nationwide.

Our community does not offer much employment to the student; that is, the town offers little, but, of

course, the University offers quite a bit. Our concern is not only for the students, but the students' wives and other people who try to assist by helping the students financially through school.

In 1955, the first USES officer was invited to our campus. This was before the date any of you mentioned, I think. He was invited there as a part-time man. I was not on the campus then, but he came to the campus, I think, two or three days a week, on a part-time basis.

We did not have an employment service, as such, at that time. We had a graduate student who was given part-time employment in the office, and so the two combined, made up our employment office at that time. This did not include future placement. We had then an independent teacher placement office, and we still do have an independent teacher placement office.

Two years ago, our President hired the first full-time person in the employment office. This was an emeritus status man. He had just turned sixty-five. He was given full responsibility for the employment office on our campus. At this time, the USES people were invited to place a full-time man in that office, too, and so for two years now, there have been two full-time persons in the office, with one secretary. They work together very well; they are very cooperative. I understand that they are happy with the relationship. The University is happy, too, and they are trying to expand the services.

The office itself, which two years ago had practically no businesses visit the campus for interviews, last year had 175 companies and governmental agencies visit the campus. This year we had 246 visits to our campus. They interviewed, I guess, around eight to nine hundred students; I am not sure of the exact number. We graduated 1340 students this year, and half of them were interviewed in the student employment service, and they had available to them any contacts that the USES office had, or that they wanted to use when these visits were made on the campus.

In addition to that, the wives of the students, and, in some cases, the parents of students, use the combined offices of the two men. They are used, also, in securing part-time or full-time jobs for students.

I think I indicated what the general attitude is. Both men are happy and our campus is happy. The first indication that I had that there might be some question about it was when our man, the University man, received this communication that we have talked about here and read it, he wrote me a letter before I left and he said he was opposed to what he said they were going to do. He said he liked the relation, as it was, but he would hate to see them

expand the services that they had. When I asked him what evidence he had of this happening, he said the only evidence he had received was from the communications he had received from the people now engaged in the struggle. The Chamber of Commerce had sent him one communication and he had received one from another source, but otherwise he had had no indication that there was to be an expansion.

The other schools in our State oppose our relationship. They have large employment offices. They are large universities and they feel that they are paying for part of our employment office. One is a private school. I notice in the Congressional report, it quotes them as saying we are exploiting the American taxpayer, which, I suppose, is true from their point of view.

The University of Utah, which is in Salt Lake City, does not have this arrangement. It has a very extensive employment placement center and they have had it for many years. They have not chosen to invite USES to their campus, and so it is not there. There are a number of smaller schools which do not have their own placement center, nor do they have USES.

I think that is sufficient, Mr. Chairman, to tell you what we do and what our attitude is about it.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: We have had four views expressed here, and to that add the view expressed by the Committee which studied the problem this year. I presume there are members of the panel who would like to challenge each other, but I would much rather, at this point, like to call on the members here.

DEAN HAROLD E. STEWART (Wayne State University): I would like Dr. Foltman to comment, if he will, on two things: First, on the Committee's conclusions, as to the goals of the USES, as defined on page two of the Committee's report; and second, on Dr. Peters' point, if I got it right, that despite many attempts at communication with USES to invite them to meet with placement people and to sit down and see what kind of cooperative arrangements can be worked out, he received no answer. Did I interpret your statement correctly?

DR. PETERS: I have had no offer from them to do this after my request.

DEAN STEWART: I should like Dr. Foltman's comments on both of these matters.

DR. FOLTMAN: I am happy to comment on the ad hoc committee's report, as it relates to what they have indicated they think the goals of the USES are. The report states:

"1. The USES wanted ultimately to require all college seniors to register with the State Employment offices at the beginning of the senior year, regardless of the students' future educational or employment plans."

I would say this is not correct. I would say that the person who wrote this was obviously thinking of a private employment service, and that person, in any situation says, "I would like to get as many applicants as I possibly can." Remember, it is a premise of the USES that this is a voluntary operation. The only ones who have to sign up, are those who are receiving unemployment insurance. Those who are receiving unemployment insurance have to sign up in order to receive it. The answer is no, that is not the intent, and I do not think there is any evidence any place to the contrary.

DEAN STEWART: In the "Resolved", it states "oppose any future governmental legislation or expansion of regulations in existing governmental agencies", and so on. Is there any pending legislation that changes that?

DR. FOLTMAN: Not that I know of.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: These three items were found in the April, 1962 document. Notation is made that this was amended in '63. I, as Chairman of the Committee, and the author of this statement, frankly -- it was approved by every member of the Committee, however -- can cite the source of where this statement was made in April of 1962, granting that this was changed by USES in January, 1963.

DR. FOLTMAN: That takes care of the point. In other words, the citation is made from the original document. I do not recall that particular statement, but I take it you found words to that effect.

I would say this from another point of view: I have been there for one year as an outsider, if you will, trying to help and implement the goals and policies of this operation, and I have not found this to be true. I would say with respect to points 2 and 3, I do not see anything of a problem there.

Let's get into the other area now. With respect to what Dr. Peters has said --

DEAN STEWART: Let's back up a minute. I would like your reaction to points 2 and 3.

DR. FOLTMAN: I indicated I do not agree basically with any one of these points. I will be more specific if you want me to. I do not think that the United States Employment Service has ever, or will ever be in a position, or should be in a position to tell any college placement

operation whether or not its services are adequate, in the sense of impugning any part of the operation or controlling that part of the operations.

Is that what you want, sir?

DEAN STEWART: Yes.

DR. FOLTMAN: I do not think they have been, or are, or will be, or should be in the business of this kind of assessment or valuation. I stand, and I think they stand and should stand, on the point that if and as and when they have a relationship with the University of Utah, or anybody else, that that relationship has been developed on the basis of being invited in; the relationship is developed on the basis that they were asked in, and that the relationship is mutually beneficial to both parties -- to the institution and the public employment service.

Now, point 3 has a number of facets and ramifications to it. By and large what I think Dr. Peters has said on a number of occasions is that the United States Employment Service is attempting, or has attempted, or said that it wants to come onto a campus to talk to students about jobs, and without telling anybody on that campus except that student, who these employers are. I do not think that would make much sense. I do not think this is the policy nor should be the policy.

DR. PETERS: This just happened in Minnesota: I talked with the placement director last week and they refused to give him the names of the people they were interviewing for, and they took registrations at that time. They said they would try, if they could, to tell him where they had placed the people.

I think it is very important that we keep our relationships with our businesses and industries, which have supported the schools to a great extent, and thank goodness that they did, too.

DR. FOLTMAN: I am not familiar with the Minnesota case.

DR. PETERS: I just received this information.

DR. FOLTMAN: Let me get on to the other part of it; we can come back to that.

With respect to negotiations in Washington, I am not familiar with all of them, but I know about some of them because I have been there the last year. I have read some of the correspondence and I have participated in some of the meetings myself.

It seems to me that the United States Employment Service is being asked to do things that it is not in a position to do. It is being asked to negotiate things which it considers to be legislative mandates and which it cannot negotiate about. Dr. Peters and others say, "If you do so-and-so, we will do so-and-so."

The Government employee is not in the business of negotiating a program which has been legislated and provided for by Congress, and which he implements with the administrative arm of the Government.

DR. PETERS: It is not negotiation, but an interpretation of the mandate, and your interpretation of the mandate is much different from ours.

Do you think that money from the United States Employment Service, through the State affiliates, should be used to send people out into the territory to counsel high school students? Do you think that is within the mandate of the Wagner-Peyser Act?

DR. FOLTMAN: Yes.

DR. PETERS: What?

DR. FOLTMAN: Yes, sir.

DR. PETERS: You think it is. This has nothing to do with employment; this is counseling the student on what college he ought to go to.

DR. FOLTMAN: It is not divisible. If he counsels, he works on several phases. He can work on various levels with respect to various things. In my own case, as I have worked with students, I have counseled them about employment, further education, and I have counseled them -- and I want to speak modestly now -- with regard to personal problems. I cannot divide the counsel into phase one, two, or three, and say this is how it works. I think it is a very, very complicated process.

DR. PETERS: Should these resources from USES be available for other types of services for students? In other words, should they be put in the counseling services, and you hire counselors to be on the campuses to do this counseling?

DR. FOLTMAN: The first part, I answered; the second part, I cannot answer.

DR. PETERS: It is the same thing; it is just how far you interpret the law.

DR. FOLTMAN: We should be clear on one thing,

Dr. Peters. What I say here is not an official interpretation. I am an individual with an orientation toward Government and Government services. I do not represent an association like you do. These are personal opinions.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Are there any questions?

DEAN RICHARD A. SIGGELKOW (State University of New York): This is a rather peculiar communication difficulty. I think a lot of people would be willing to say to a state agency, "Look, if you have these vacancies, send them over and we will give you credit for them. We know our people and we would like to be able to work with them." I wonder why the Federal Government or the State Governments feel that they have to hold this information unto themselves and they only, and only they, can work directly with the students. Why do they hesitate to work with the placement people?

Why is there a feeling among placement people that the state employment people are trying to "corner the market" -- and that is in quotation marks?

DR. FOLTMAN: I am not sure I understand the question. Let me do it this way: Are you saying that state employment people come to a college campus, first of all, and then -- well, let's be very, very specific at this point. What do they say with respect to jobs and people?

DEAN SIGGELKOW: What I cannot understand is why they would not simply report these vacancies to a good, operating college placement service.

DR. FOLTMAN: In other words, you are saying state employment people know about vacancies?

DEAN SIGGELKOW: Yes.

DR. FOLTMAN: You are saying, why do they not come to me, at the University of Buffalo and say, "I have knowledge of X number of jobs. You have knowledge of X number of students. Why don't you tell the students about these jobs?" Is that the question?

DEAN SIGGELKOW: I guess my point is -- and it leads into my second question -- this would then release the state employment people and permit them to tackle the problem which I think is far greater -- the drop-outs and the unemployment, and since the placement people are doing a good job and are placing all of our people, that is why I have raised the question I have.

DR. FOLTMAN: I would argue that you place all of your people. I do not think you do.

With respect to the first part of your question, it seems the answer lies in the traditional procedures established over twenty-five or thirty years in the placement process, in the operation of a public employment office, which says that in order to have a verified placement, certain things have to be accomplished by the public employment service officer, to-wit: He has to have knowledge of a specific job order from an employer; he has to do something with respect to selecting people for that opening; and he has to send applicants to that employer; and, further, he has to have verification that a transaction was accomplished -- that the employer did in fact agree to hire somebody.

All of this is established not by law, but by tradition for thirty years. This is how a public employment office in Buffalo, or elsewhere, gets credit for a legal placement.

Now, these legal placements, as you are well aware, are extremely important, because this becomes a matter of going back, year after year, for an appropriation for this agency for the next year's administration. Therefore, I can see why there is very great concern.

DR. PETERS: Which means the very thing we have said here -- the interest is in the registrations and referrals, so you can justify your budget and increase it the following year.

DR. FOLTMAN: A good placement man should complete the process. When I was a placement officer in a college, my dean came to me and said, "Look, Foltman, never mind the nice gobbledegook about your counseling. I know you are a good counselor. How many students did you place?"

I was concerned with numbers. These people are, and should be, concerned with numbers.

DR. PETERS: I think we should give more regard to individuals, and not statistics.

DR. FOLTMAN: The statistics represent the real accomplishment.

DR. PETERS: What his question asks is why a state employment service will not tell him what opportunity was available to a student, and say it is so-and-so, and perhaps refer it to him and let him take care of it. The state employment service man does not know whether it is a good company; whether we have had good experience with the company; whether it is an industry on the up-swing or down-swing; and whether the company is going to have some problems with governmental contracts that we might know about. Therefore, it is an item which I call secrecy.

DR. FOLTMAN: I would like to ask my friend on the left to answer that. You may want to comment on that, but with respect to you doing very well in placing your students, I would hope you are doing very well at the University of Buffalo, but you cannot tell me here this afternoon that you are placing all of your people.

I work at the University of Cornell and I have worked there since 1949, and for a number of years in a placement capacity in one of the professional schools there. We have never, in the best of years, placed everybody, and we have, at Cornell, I think, a recognized professional placement operation. They strive hard and work diligently at the job of getting kids located, but they cannot, and do not, place everybody.

DR. PETERS: You feel the state employment service would accomplish this?

DR. FOLTMAN: I did not say that. I was referring to the one point.

DEAN SIGGELKOW: I would say yes, we do place every qualified person. We have no difficulty here. That is why I get concerned -- because it is a duplication of effort here. Maybe we have a pretty good placement bureau.

DR. FOLTMAN: I hope so. Do you have an art school?

DEAN SIGGELKOW: We have an art school and we place the art school graduates, and we do a pretty good job in these areas. I am certainly not adverse to accepting help from the outside. Maybe if there are people left over, there is, sometimes, a reason for them being left over.

I wonder why it is, with our economy in the position it seems to be in, and the terrific flooding of the market with drop-outs, that the Federal Government does not tackle this problem more directly. I am not opposed to accepting help, but I am afraid we are overlooking a serious area.

DR. FOLTMAN: Can I ask you to put yourself in the shoes of a public employment officer? How can an employment officer in any industrialized area of the world do a job for just the unemployed? How many employers do you think a public employment officer could go to and with how many could he make effective deals, if all he could say to that employer was, "I have a lot of poor unfortunates who are unemployed"?

DEAN SIGGELKOW: I am not talking about poor unfortunates. I am saying your very answer gives me the feeling that this is the number one problem in our country.

DR. FOLTMAN: I agree with you. As Mr. Kennedy has said, and as a lot of important people have said, the number one problem is unemployment.

DR. PETERS: He feels that the resources should be going elsewhere, rather than to the field where we believe the problem is being adequately handled.

DR. FOLTMAN: I think you should tell the Federal Government to increase and expand its program in many, many different areas, to take care of it, but this is not going to do it.

COORDINATOR WILLIAM BANAGHAN (Southern Illinois University): The statement has been made in the resolution that the professional people are being handled adequately. I happen to get the APA Employment Bulletin, and also the APGA Unemployment Bulletin. I am aware that we have a placement service; I am aware that we have private employment placement services. We also have the Government placement services.

I am wondering why, if our service is so adequate, so many people are willing to send their name in to the APA Bulletin or APGA Bulletin, which take about six weeks just to get a person's name in print, before they can possibly get any answers.

DR. PETERS: I cannot answer that. You are dealing in an area there primarily with experienced personnel.

COORDINATOR BANAGHAN: This is not necessarily experienced personnel.

DR. PETERS: I would assume so.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Do we not advise, as we counsel, the students to register with their college placement service; if they are going into student personnel work, to register with AGA; and the sociologists refer their students not only to their placement service, but they refer them also to the National Sociological Placement Service. This is good counsel.

COORDINATOR BANAGHAN: I think it is good counsel. My point is they have not been adequately served at this time. I think it is good counsel to suggest where they may be served and to use these various resources, but I question strongly as to whether or not there is "adequate professional services" through the colleges alone at this time.

From the point of view of an employer, it is extremely difficult to make contacts throughout the country to get adequate people. I personally feel that the state

employment services or the private employment services, and others, add very little to the college employment services, but hang it all, I want that little bit, too.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: We have a question over here. Yes, sir.

DEAN RUSSELL A. JOHNSTON (Richmond Professional Institute): I would like to ask Dr. Foltman if studies were made prior to the instituting of this service, and if they were made, if these studies indicated that there was a need for this service; further, if such a need was indicated, how was it determined? Were there large numbers of professional people unable to get jobs after they had finished college?

DR. FOLTMAN: Studies have been made ever since the organization was founded -- ever since 1930. There have been all kinds of labor surveys adopted, such as the Bureau of Labor Statistics, all pointing up the fact that our professional manpower is exceedingly important; all pointing up the fact that this, by any definition, is an area where, if we are going to have public manpower support, we have to be concerned about the professional occupations, from a public employment service standpoint.

DR. PETERS: Will you tell me one piece of research which has been done?

DR. FOLTMAN: There is all kinds of manpower data. In the monthly Labor Review, you get a statistical section month by month.

DR. PETERS: Will you quote me some research that has been done, that will indicate to us that there were a lot of unemployed professional people, before you started this quest?

DR. FOLTMAN: The United States Employment Service does not have to find unemployed people, because it does not accept your definition. It is a public "employment" office and not an "unemployment" office. It is concerned with anybody who, on a voluntary basis, wants to use the services of this voluntary service to locate himself in a position. You would prefer to make it "unemployment" service, but you are in the minority, luckily, for the moment.

DIRECTOR R. W. WYGLES (Kansas State Teachers College): After reviewing this, or studying this last year after it was published, I am of the opinion, having been a placement officer for several years prior to going into the Dean's office, that this is one more step taken by President Kennedy to employ more people in order to get rid of the unemployed which we now have. It is a duplication of the services which we have.

In Kansas, we do not have the unemployment problem; of course, we do not have the people there, either, that are on the east and west coast. Our State people, working in the State organizations, in the State unemployment and employment office, tell us they do not have enough help to do the job now, of getting out in the field in the programs which they are supposed to be carrying out now, and they hope this will not limit the operation they are supposed to be doing. They are worried about doing the job they are supposed to be doing, let alone taking on another operation without adequate help.

DR. FOLTMAN: I concur and I hope that this does not deter any other programs that are going on. I would agree with that.

DEAN JOHN W. TRUITT (Indiana State College): On page 2, in paragraph number 3, in the last sentence -- well, in part of the paragraph it describes a procedure around which the employment would take place, and in the last sentence it refers to an effort on the part of the Government, or someone, to eliminate discrimination. This has not been discussed. Would you like to say a word about this?

DEAN BURTENSHAW: You mean it is in his paper?

DEAN TRUITT: No, in the Committee report. It is item 3.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Yes, it is item 3. May I comment?

DR. FOLTMAN: Can we hear that again? What is the question?

DEAN TRUITT: I would like for you to comment on it. This has not been discussed here. Is that one of the aims of this Service? Would this not be one of the by-products of the Service and, if so, is the procedure based upon that? Is that involved in this procedure?

DR. FOLTMAN: I do not know what the background is, but I will quote to you the official policy of the United States Employment Service, which is that placements will be made without regard to race, color or creed.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: May I defend this statement, or elaborate on it -- I think that is better than "defend". This was based on several of the documents defending -- using Chet's words -- the secrecy of record-keeping in the USES. It is, specifically, that the Federal Government cannot give to an employer, or a potential employer, the names of candidates based on religious or racial conditions.

The employer would say, "I need a man to twist a screw in this machine." The Government would have to say, officially, "Here is a man who can twist a screw in that machine faster than anyone you have ever seen, and you, Mr. Employer, are not to be concerned, or the Government cannot be concerned with the fact that this potential employee is of a particular race or religion" (which may or may not cause a problem in the employer's mind). It is for this reason -- on a no-discrimination basis -- that the USES in this original document defended its position on secrecy (again using Chet's words).

DR. FOLTMAN: You are not suggesting any change in the policy, are you?

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I say that the Federal Government has to defend this policy.

DR. FOLTMAN: I would hope so.

DEAN TRUITT: My next question then is this: Was there evidence that there was discrimination in college placements that led to some of this activity?

DR. FOLTMAN: Not that I know of.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I do not think so.

DR. FOLTMAN: I do not think that has ever been any kind of a problem. It is a standard policy and it has been part of the operations for many, many years. As you are well aware, right now it is being looked at under all kinds of microscopes.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: It is four o'clock. We have time for just another quick question or two. I would like to close this very soon.

COORDINATOR OSBORNE B. PARKER (Southern Illinois University): I have a question to Dr. Foltman. You stated that there was a mandate that indicated that USES should go in this direction. However, your adversary, Dr. Peters, indicated that attempts by this group to get together with certain officials in the United States Department of Labor came to no end. Can you defend this action, or are you in no position to do so?

DR. FOLTMAN: I am in no position to do it. I would say Dr. Peters has used properly all the channels open to him. He has testified before the Professional Committees, both Senate and House, and tried to get meetings with the responsible administrators, and he has taken his case to the public. What else do you want him to do? He has done a very good job.

COORDINATOR PARKER: I am not asking you what he should do. I am asking you why his efforts are being blocked at certain levels.

DR. FOLTMAN: His efforts are being blocked -- and I will be very serious, sir -- per his definition.

COORDINATOR PARKER: You are using paralogical inexactitudes.

DR. FOLTMAN: He is using the proper procedures and he is getting a hearing every time he asks for it.

DIRECTOR WYGLES (Kansas State Teachers College): One of the reasons NASPA will probably carry this resolution is because he has not received an answer, or a meeting, but he is still trying.

DR. FOLTMAN: He is not going to get an answer from the administrators as to changes in the interpretation of the laws, which has been going on for thirty years. The only route that he can take to get changes made is the professional route, and you are taking it.

DR. PETERS: You see, what we are really getting at here is no one has ever said, "Let's see where the USES can serve the present placement function and help improve it." They have only said, "We want to go in and put some people on the campuses." They have not said anything about research; they have not said anything about workshop programs; they have not said anything about certain types of publications, or what do we need or what might we need. They have said nothing about those things.

I have had no response to our invitation to sit down with us and talk about it. The correspondence is here for anybody who wants to read it. This concerns me no end, because it means that we have been asking the Government what we can do about this, and to me it has been a one-sided sort of thing. The Government sits there and is not interested in the students, in us, or in our programs. They are interested in expanding their program, and they are interested in statistics by which they will expand their program.

I am really concerned about this issue. That is why I have given the time I have to it.

DR. FOLTMAN: I hope you do not really believe that last statement, because that is not correct. As far as dealing with an organization is concerned, I think you represent a special kind of an organization. You do not represent the students, except indirectly. The Public Employment Office, through the States, is interested in students and particularly institutions, but not, in particular, college student placement.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I would like to thank the college placement officers, who represent students, as do I in my present function, although, frankly, I do not have as many contacts with them as I had when I was Dean of Men, but I still represent students in all of my functions, and I "dang well better".

DR. FOLTMAN: As I do.

DEAN STEWART (Wayne State University): May I remark in passing that what I think Dr. Peters is saying is that we have here an operation of Parkinson's law.
(Laughter)

What I want to ask you, really, Dave, is whether I am interpreting the resolution, which will be offered tomorrow, correctly, when I say the Committee is suggesting that present legislation is acceptable, but they do not want any further extension of it. Is that correct?

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: Yes. The Committee members spent a lot of time talking about this "Therefore be it Resolved" section, because, literally, the Act of 1934 gave to the USES as much power as they would want to assume.

The members of this Committee have been hard-working people, gentlemen. This has not been just a five-minute get-together to put something into a statement for Convention action. The members of this Committee are not anti-USES. These people are deans and directors of placement, as you can see their names on this report. In their capacities, they want to cooperate with professional placement agencies, USES, NASPA agencies -- all of them.

If I can sense the feeling of the Ad Hoc Committee, it is this: We would like to have the NASPA Convention consider and accept the resolution, to express officially, from the group of deans throughout the country, that we think that in the main college placement functions are being cared for properly, according to the tenets of the administrators in these universities.

Bridgeport says, "We handle ours with USES." Bless them. No one is saying they should not. As a Committee, though, we feel that further expansion of USES involvement, particularly as per their April, 1962 statement, which I may say parenthetically -- and I will put it on the record -- was insulting to the intelligence of college personnel administrators throughout the country, which was toned down in January, 1963, primarily, I feel, because of the influence of professional organizations, one of which was CPC and another one was the Chamber of Commerce, is not needed.

We are not saying that the members of USES should not serve the members of the population as they see fit,

but we want NASPA to join the other organizations by saying, "Let's do this where it is needed." Let's keep the tone one of cooperation as the January, '63 statement says, and not go back to the April, '62 statement, which says, in essence, you people should contact the presidents of the universities and give them this very nice package, rather than the placement people, and, in essence, if you will, take over the functioning of their placement office.

If a university administrator let's USES come in, I do not think NASPA has any right to say, "Do not take that help." Frankly, I think this organization here, NASPA, should support the voice that says, "Let's keep the relationship one of cooperation rather than one of excessive aggression."

Does this respond to your question?

DEAN STEWART: I think so. What your resolution says is not exactly that; it could be considered to imply that, though.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: The wording of this was rather carefully done.

DEAN WILLIAM V. BURGER (Colorado School of Mines): I have not heard anything mentioned about the attitude of industry people. I would like to know if there was anything done on either side of this problem concerning the viewpoint of industry.

I heard a man from a California oil company two weeks ago express very definite opposition to having the Federal Employment Service do their recruiting for them. He said, "I think we are tending toward a strong Government for weak people."

I feel that we ought to at least give this some thought. If it could be done better on this level, I would be willing to surrender my part in placement, but I feel the industry people feel that the relationships they have built up over the years have served them very well and they would like to see these relationships continue.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: I cannot speak for all of American industry as Chairman of this Committee, but I am led to believe there is strong support from the representatives of industry and business to continue this cooperative relationship, and there is not dissatisfaction among these people with the existing college placement services. Chet, I am sure, could cite chapter and verse on this better than I, and my file is huge.

DR. FOLTMAN: I would have to ask for equal time on that, but it is too late.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: You are welcome to it.

DR. FOLTMAN: You cannot have a functioning public employment office unless you have business or employer support. That is obvious, by definition. This is not a compulsory obligation; it is cooperation. We have not campaigned nor asked for testimonials.

CHAIRMAN ROBINSON: We could go on, but I would like to call this meeting to a close. My thanks to the members of the panel for being here, and particularly you, Dr. Foltman.

The meeting is adjourned.

... Seminar VI, "College Placement Services",
adjourned at four-fifteen o'clock p.m. ...

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SEMINAR VIII

June 27, 1963

Seminar VIII convened at two-forty-five o'clock, Chairman Mark Smith, Dean of Men, Denison University, presiding.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: We will call this meeting at twenty of four, no matter what is happening. If it ends before that, that is one thing, but we will call this meeting. People have been sitting a long time. We will leave everything else to imagination.

The topic of this Seminar tells you absolutely nothing about the content of it, which is intentional, I guess.

The speaker, I think, is known to most of you. The topic is "Formulating National Educational Policy in the Private Sector." That is nice. Got that?

The first remarks will be made by Mr. Lawrence Dennis, who is Director of Academic Affairs of the American Council on Education. I am not going to go through his background. He was Vice President for Academic Affairs at Pennsylvania State University and I think in this role some of you knew him. The rest of his history can be inferred from the dates of arrival of his children. 1944, 1952, 1955 and 1957. From that you can spell out exactly what he was doing in those years, I think. (Laughter)

Mr. Dennis, would you please kick this thing off, and then the members of the panel, whom you certainly know, will respond, and I think we then will move quickly to responses, to initiations from the floor.

In case you do not know the panel, by the way, and they will speak in this order, after Mr. Dennis's remarks are completed, we will ask for remarks from Tom Emmet, first, then Carl Grip, then Ed Williamson, and finally Don Winbigler. I will not make any remarks until nothing else remains.

Mr. Dennis.

DIRECTOR LAWRENCE DENNIS (Commission of Academic Affairs, American Council on Education): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will take the liberty of standing at least for a while. I have been sitting with these gentlemen now since the noon hour.

I appreciated this short and yeasty introduction. (Laughter)

I think I should first say that when O. D. Roberts called to ask if I would come today and talk with you a bit

about the role of the American Council on Education and its affiliate organizations, in terms of its relationships with professional associations such as this one, in the formulation of national policy, we decided after some conversation to broaden the scope of it a bit and to consider, as basic to any question of relationships between the ACE and professional associations, organizations such as NASPA, that we would broaden it and talk about the whole matter of the formulation of educational policy nationally in this country.

Before we can talk about the role of educational organizations in formulating policy in the private sector, or the so-called non-governmental sector, I think it might be worthwhile for us to take a few minutes to look at the problem of how the public sector -- that is, the government sector of our society formulates educational policy, and I will leave to you, because you are much more familiar with it than I, the question of how policy is formulated by your various local and state governments in the public sector. In that connection, I would simply refer you, however, to a set of documents that is always very intriguing to me.

If I were to read the recent reports of the annual conference of the Governors of the states and the annual conference of the Mayors of our cities, you would find that there has developed over the past half decade or so a rather deep interest in educational matters, and that Governors of the states will devote as much as a day or two of their conference to talking about such questions as class size, student-teacher ratio, the kinds of buildings most effective for educational purposes, and so on, presumably in the context of the financial problems they face, but nonetheless, just by way of incidental information and introduction, at the municipal and state level, there is an increasing attention being paid by public officials to matters which heretofore have tended to have been reserved to institutions, and their trustees, and committees, and their relationships with the legislatures.

With regard to the federal government, I am sure all of you know that in one way or another the federal government has been giving aid to higher education, almost since this country began.

There is being issued this week the spring issue of the Educational Record, which is devoted to the whole matter of higher education in the federal government, the title of which is "Partners in Search of Policies," and in that issue of the Record, which is published by the American Council on Education, you would have an opportunity to read some things about the whole history and scope in the matter of the relationship between the government and colleges and universities.

As you know also, almost every agency of the federal

government is now involved, in one way or another, with an educational program. Many of them, a great many of them, the programs are beamed toward or involving colleges and universities. However, it is still a fact, tragically so, in my judgment, but it is still a fact that after all of these years there has not been developed or enunciated by the federal government a long-term, over-all national policy toward higher education.

What these departments and agencies of the government have been doing, what they have come to do through the years, has grown up largely as a result of actions that the Congress and the Executive Branch has taken on an ad hoc or crisis basis, such as the GI Bill, during World War II, the legislation passed at the early days of the Korean War, and the spot Sputnik legislation of 1958, the so-called National Defense Education Act.

However, indicative of the capricious, or casual, or ad hoc, informal way in which federal policy is made by the government, with reference to education, let me just cite a few facts for you by way of little anecdotes. For example, what has come to be called the Aid to the Impacted Areas Bill, that is in which the federal government gives federal aid to schools and those parts of the country that are impacted or crowded because of defense or other federal installations, that bill was an outgrowth, and this is a true story, of a conversation that the then distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, Robert Taft had with the then U.S. Commissioner of Education, Earl McGrath, in a tailor shop in Washington, in the mid-1950's, shortly after the Korean conflict began, in which both of these men were there for the reason that they were having their pants pressed. They were behind the screen to which male customers are sent, and they started talking about the problem of President Truman's Aid to Education bill and the fact that the Senate was not doing anything about it, and so on. And the Commissioner was talking to the Senator about how they might develop some action, and Senator Taft said, "You people are just trying to bite off too much with your proposed legislation. What you should do is to pinpoint a target. Why not federal aid for areas that are crowded because of federal defense activities?" And it was out of that conversation that the drafted bill began to come out of the Office of Education for federal aid to the so-called impacted areas, and it was not really until both the House and Senate had passed the bill that the White House itself decided to support it.

The same thing was true in another way of the National Defense Education Act. Regretfully, this was not the product of leadership on the part of any national educational organizations. It was instead the brainchild of Senator Lister Hill, who assigned his Chief of Staff on the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, immediately after Sputnik, to draft legislation that would take into account the

country's needs, both in the fields of lower and higher education, brought on by the cold war, and the needs in terms of strengthening our long-term defense posture.

Well, what came out, as you know, was a long series of titles, which really encompassed a great many aspects of higher education, as well as lower education, aid to help establish language laboratories, counseling and guidance titles, the media research titles, a whole gamut of titles that were developed, initially, by the staff of the Committee on Education and Labor, after conversations with representatives from higher education and other areas of the country in different parts of the land.

Well, again, the federal government, the White House, and the national educational organizations were rather late in coming into the game. They did not decide, until the House and Senate were almost ready to act, whether or not to support this legislation at all, even though if there was one piece of legislation that was a foregone conclusion that it would be passed, that was it. The National Education Television Construction Act, which was passed by the last session of the Congress, was another example of how laws get passed, despite the lack of educational leadership.

Several people interested in educational television went to some Senators interested in educational television and said "How do we get federal funds to help in the construction of educational television's purposes, for E.B.T. purposes around the country?" They said, "First of all, don't put it in to the Education Committee. Put it in to the Interstate Commerce Committee." That is what happened. Senator Magnuson picked up the ball in the Senate, and Harris in the House, these two men being on the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the bill got through, even though it was the only single piece of legislation affecting education that was passed in the last session of the Congress.

The same thing can be said about the College Housing Loan program, which really was the outgrowth of a conversation that Senator Fulbright had in a social setting with two or three college presidents back several years ago. At the present time, if there is any single piece of legislation that seems to have a chance in the Congress, it is that that relates to aid to technical institutes, aid for technical education. This fact is testimony to the hard work, the great spade work that has been done over the past three or four years by Congressman Brademas of Indiana and members of his staff and the Sub-Committee of the House Education and Labor Committee. These men have gone all over the United States. This legislation did not result from initiative on the part of the higher education community. It resulted from the fact that Congressman Brademas saw that in our economy we seemed to have need for a certain kind of legislation to help bring more people into the technical fields.

Well, as I say, that may have a chance of passage this year.

The Space Administration came into being because the then Senator Johnson and Senator Kerr thought that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration ought to be created, and yet that one agency over the next ten years is going to have a greater impact on the course of graduate and professional education in this country, probably, than all the other agencies at the present time combined, if only for their fellowship program alone, which is going to run into millions of dollars.

Recently Mr. Heckscher, the President's consultant on the Arts, submitted a very significant report to the President on the country's needs in culture and the arts, and, again, over the next two or three years, we may see evolving with initiative from the federal government some kind of legislation which conceivably would have to have a long-term impact on the course of colleges and universities in this country.

There are also some examples of how legislative policy or federal policy in the public sector is not made that would be interesting to you, I believe.

Last year, when the Senate had passed a higher education bill and the House was debating a higher education bill on the floor, as many of you know, one or more of the organizations that represent a section of education in the United States decided to oppose the bill and, as a result, partly, at least, of their opposition, it was remanded to the Committee, referred back to the Committee. In other words, at the very time when the Congress was about to act, there appeared a division in the educational community and the Congress in effect said, "A pox on both your houses," and sent the bill back to Committee.

The Peace Corps Act has resulted in having some great meaning for American colleges and universities, one of the few new pieces of legislation this Congress has passed, and yet not very many of you may know that the Peace Corps Act, actually, was voted out in the House of Representatives in September 1961 because Congressman Smith of Virginia, the Chairman of the House Rules Committee, informed the administration that he would give it the choice of one bill to be given a rule by his Committee on which the House could debate that September, and the administration had to pick between the Peace Corps Act and the Manpower Training Act, which was also then before the Rules Committee, so Congressman Bolling of the administration picked the Peace Corps Act, and the Manpower Training Act had to lay over for a whole year.

These are just examples of caprice or division,

either on the part of educators themselves, or within the government, to indicate how public policy either is or is not made with reference to education.

There are some lessons in this for us, before we can talk about the private non-governmental sector. One is that that I have already given, and that is that there is no long-term, well thought out, well conceived, established federal policy toward higher education. The government has tended to act in crises or in ad hoc situations. Number two, the second generalization would be that the private sector, that is, the non-governmental sector, organizations such as yours, the American Council on Education, the NEA, and others, have always been in a position of responding to initiative taken by the Executive or Legislative branches of the government rather than providing them with guidelines, rather than leading, moulding, shaping public opinion, the private sector of the educational community generally has been in this position of needing or having to respond, and quite often to an accomplished fact.

The third generalization, witnessed by the recent examinations by the Fountain Committee into the institutes of national health, of which there have been certain allegations of misuse of funds in the biological and physical sciences. Another generalization is that there are no ground rules covering the relationship that does exist between higher education and the federal government. One agency will have one set of ground rules, and another agency will have another, and a third agency will have a third, and, as a result, there can be no meaningful set of ground rules really interpreted from this very vital, crucial partnership that exists between the federal government and higher education.

The fourth generalization is that there has been in the public sector, that is, within the federal government, a lack of -- I believe "lack of" would be the best phrase -- a complete lack of coordination of educational policy. There are more education programs going on outside of the Office of Education than there are inside the Office of Education. The Department of Agriculture has its educational program, the Atomic Energy Commission has one, NIH has one, NASA, as I said earlier, will have one, and there has not been effected an administrative horizontal coordination of educational policy within the federal government itself.

Lastly, bringing us to our topic today, there has not been, until recently, regrettably and tragically, any real attempt that even bordered on success to coordinate the development of educational policy in the private sector. There has not been a massive considered attempt to coordinate elements within the educational community to help provide the Executive and Legislative branches of the government

with the kind of guidelines they need in order to effectuate a long-range policy.

This lack of coordination has resulted recently in some suggestions, both in the Congress and by private citizens, that there be created a national advisory committee on education. Congressman Lindsay and Congresswoman Green are pushing bills that would set up a national advisory committee, advisory to the President on Educational Affairs. There has also been proposed a national citizens committee on higher education, which presumably would be a citizens committee comparable to that that existed a few years ago, the National Citizens Committee for the Public Schools. The citizens committee would attempt to establish priorities, and guide the public generally in what our national higher education policy should be.

It is my own personal belief, as some of you have heard me say on another occasion, that with more students coming into our colleges and universities, with the cost of education going up, both private costs and to the tax payer, that we are going to be faced inevitably, and rightfully in my judgment, in the next several years, with a greatly increased public scrutiny of what is going on in our colleges and universities. More and more people, just by virtue of the fact that they are going to have their youngsters on the campuses, are going to be interested in what a college does, what it is, what it stands for. They are going to want to know, and they are going to ask some pretty tough questions about things like faculty loads, student personnel policies, all the rest of the things that we are all concerned with on a day to day basis, and, in my judgment, the higher education community is going to have to respond with a great deal of candor, in helping to get to the citizens of this country much more information about the problems facing higher education. We are going to have to make certain that we are not defensive about what we do, and, most importantly, for our discussion here, we are going to have to get our own houses in order, in terms of coordinating what our many organizations, councils, committees are doing in the formulation of policy.

For example, it would be intriguing to me, if there were to be a national citizens committee on higher education, if they were to look into the national student personnel services area and were to try to make sense out of the fact that there are now extant some 30-odd organizations in this field, all of them presumably with a well thought out mission, all of them presumably with a purpose in life, and yet this is the kind of thing that I think we are going to have to explain more and more not only to ourselves -- we do not do a very good job of that -- but to the public at large.

Now, what about the American Council on Education, and its relationships with groups such as NASPA? As you know,

the American Council on Education represents close to 1500 institutions of higher education in this country, and several scores of organizations and associations in the field of education. These institutions and organizations represent all sectors of higher education. The American Association of Colleges, which is private liberal arts colleges, the Land Grant Associations, State University Association, the public institutions, the Association for Higher Education, a great number of the discipline organizations, the American Psychological Association, and so on, all these organizations, including some of the organizations in the student personnel field, hold constituent or associate membership in the American Council on Education.

The Council, fortunately, recently, in its re-organization, and in the appointment of Dr. Logan Wilson, formerly Chancellor of the University of Texas, as President of the Council, the Council was given rather substantial grants by Ford, Carnegie, the Sloan Foundation, with some additional funds to come from the Rockefeller Foundation, and others, to mount and carry on a program designed to provide leadership to the cause of higher education in this country.

We recognize that this cannot be done without the full constructive and mutual understanding between ACE and its member associations and organizations, institutions, groups such as NASPA. We recognize also that organizations such as yours ought to be and want to be in on the take-offs as well as the crash landings on policies that sooner or later affect that segment of higher education that is of concern to you.

The work of the Council is conducted by five Commissions: The Commission on Administrative Affairs, which is concerned with the decision-making processes in institutions of higher education; the Commission on Higher Education, which is concerned with institutional projects overseas; the Commission on Plans and Objectives in Higher Education; the Commission on Academic Affairs, of which I am the Director; and the Commission on Federal Relations, which I am representing here today, since Mr. Dobbins, the Director of that Commission, could not be with you.

These five commissions are carrying on the work of the American Council on Education, and the Commission on Academic Affairs has within its purview problems relating to the student, the faculty, and the curriculum, so that it would be comparable to a broadly based academic affairs office in an institution.

Now what is needed? I would like to cite a few things, and then sit down in the hope that the panel would perhaps elicit the discussion here, and from you in the audience.

First of all, in my judgment, much more coordination

on federal policy questions is needed within institutions themselves. It really does not help the cause of higher education too much if the president of an institution has not communicated his interest in and concern for federal legislative matters to members of his staff who might be the kind of resource people he should draw on in making judgments on matters that he is called upon to make judgments on by the American Council on Education. It seems to me, therefore, that the office of the president has the responsibility of initiating, if it does not exist already, some kind of a mechanism within each institution wherein deans of students, as well as business officers, and provosts, and the development officers, and the other line officers of the university, where they are drawn into discussions of, on a rather regular basis, federal policy questions, so that if there are matters in the area of student affairs, let us say, on which someone such as Dean Williamson might be expected to be one of the country's major authorities, his president would have had the presence of mind to consult with Dean Williamson and his staff before voicing a judgment in Washington, in an ACE meeting, or in some other context about a matter that would relate back to whether it is foreign student affairs or placement, or what have you.

So that, first of all, there is this problem of getting coordination within institutions, and I think that people in organizations such as yours ought to be assuming the initiative on our campuses, the deans of students, and the men and women on their staff, should be pressing the president's office to effect this kind of coordination so that the business officer does not wind up being the only person other than the president who knows something about what is going on in Washington.

Then, obviously, organizational coordination is needed. I would be the first to agree that the American Council on Education has in the past been negligent and delinquent in its responsibilities to its association constituency, all of the associations and organizations that are within our constituency. We have tended to be too mindful of our institutional constituency. We are trying to effect administratively within the Council arrangements wherein we would make certain that the association and organizational constituency of the Council would be cued in on policy, consulted on policy. We would touch these very necessary bases before the Council itself decided to prepare some position papers on legislative matters. That is one of the reasons why two of us representing the Council went to the Boston meeting of ACPA, APGA, and that is why we are here with you again today.

Secondly, in terms of organizational coordination, not only does the Council need to effect better coordination with its constituents, but the constituents themselves need to effect coordination. I am referring specifically now to

the student affairs area, in which I hope it will be possible for the inter-organizational committee to hold a meeting here tomorrow to begin actively the kind of cooperation and responsible leadership in this field on behalf of the student affairs area, student personnel area, so that it will make sense not only within your own group of organizations, but to those of us who have to deal with these matters in Washington, as well as to the public at large.

Lastly, I think that there are a number of areas other than the federal relations area that we ought to think about that offer us avenues of cooperation. I cite just as examples the whole avenue of international affairs, in which the American Council on Education could certainly offer some coordinate, cooperative lateral support, if you please, to the efforts of offices of deans of students and foreign student advisers on your campuses to upgrading the whole cause of the foreign student on the campuses of the United States. Another area is in the field of long-range planning. It seems to me that we can urge the presidents who are within our constituency to cue in deans of students and their advisers on all the long-range plans in institutions, so that there could be some systematic institutional attack on the problem. Then the relationships between the student affairs offices and other offices on the campuses; we may be able to give some national attention to this problem, particularly with regard to getting the student affairs offices at least some parity with the business offices on the campuses.

Then, on the matter of social issues, I think we are entering a period in which all of us -- faculty members, administrative officers, and students -- have a responsibility to understand what the major social problems of our time are, to a degree never before known in this country. The President of the United States has recently put one moral issue squarely to the leadership, from large areas of American society, including 200 educators that he had at the White House the other day, and he has informed this leadership from all parts of the country that in his judgment educators have to learn what their responsibilities are as public leaders, that they have a moral responsibility perhaps more than any other group in our society to help this country solve this civil rights question.

I am proud that the Board of the American Council on Education this week, in a statement which will be released within the next few days, affirmed its interest in this problem to the press and is going to call on the leadership of higher education in all parts of the country, call on all of us as individuals to exercise our influence in our organizations and in our communities on matters such as housing, and so on, to try to solve the fundamental moral questions that are posed to our society in this civil rights area.

To conclude where I began, in my judgment, ladies

and gentlemen, there is a rising interest in higher education in this country, on the part of its citizenry, brought on by the enrollment crisis, and brought on by the high cost of education. There is either a great lack of information about higher education or considerable misunderstanding of higher education abroad in the land, and it is going to be up to us, as leaders in the field, to make sure that our citizens understand what our colleges are all about, what we are doing on the campuses, and we have to meet this problem with candor and with a deep sense of public responsibility. Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think you should not overlook, in responding to these very important remarks, the implications of some of the things that Mr. Dennis has said for the problems of bed fellows with which we are now struggling in this Association, and suggestions he has to make as to a point of view which I have represented at times. And now I find why I am Chairman of this group, which is summed up by a phrase, "If you don't go out you can't be second string, but you can second guess."

I think Tom Emmet should start off, especially in view of his active work with IACC, with a few remarks. A few!

DEAN EMMET: I found this year, about a year ago in May, on the assumption of the Chairmanship -- first it was just to be NASPA Representative, and later it became the Chairmanship of the Inter-Association Coordinating Subcommittee on the Professional Preparation and Development of Student Personnel Administrators -- a term which we hopefully will get shortened in a day or so -- that one of the growing concerns was, of course, the supply and demand of personnel workers in all of the various associations. We are dealing today, in the increased area of federal aid to various things in science and other areas, with enormous competition, and about the time I assumed the Chairmanship of this, along came the Kennedy Omnibus Bill, which had a little bit of everything in it for all groups, and all associations, and I would say that some, in the private area, had done an extremely good job of influencing people in Washington, in the area of their needs.

I found, not to my surprise, that in the area of student personnel work, particularly in provision for training and provision for work in that area, and legislation in that area, we were, of course, not at all represented.

I must compliment, by the way, the American Library Association on having done an excellent job on the Omnibus Bill. We did not meet their efforts.

My colleagues in some of the other associations were particularly worried about this situation, and when we

first held a Commission meeting one of the immediate problems was, to get involved in the legislative area I found, that in going to Washington I ran into a real problem in terminology, that the agencies which one must deal with in Washington have very unclear perceptions of just what we do in this profession of ours called student personnel work, and that goes from one job right on down through the other, in each association. In fact, they do not like the word "personnel" in Washington at all. They would much prefer to have us called student service workers.

I got this from varying agencies, both in the government and out of the government. I got reactions of various types of comment along these lines: You ought to get together. You ought to organize. You ought to get your terminology straight.

The Association of Collegiate Registrars did yeoman work this year in putting out a handbook that some of you are familiar with, on definitions of terms. When it came to our area, I think any of you who read the definitions and terms are disappointed because they fall far short of clearing up the confusion. Therefore, I think one of the major problems we have in dealing with the Washington scene is, first of all, in our own associations, and working together in some sort of cooperative effort we must try to pull together some sort of definition of terms so that people understand what our jobs are and what direction we are taking. I think this is one of the basic things that has to be done, and we are trying to do this in this professional training area as a first step.

The first real logical direction is to try to define our terms so that we can go before these groups in Congress, before the American Council on Education, and the other areas, and clearly define what our field is and what it is all about. The perception of our field is very poor.

This could be the fault of those of us who are deans of students, and I take complete agreement with Mr. Dennis on the fact that on the campus itself, I think this is where this begins -- I think if we can get together on our own campus and discuss the problem of terminology, job descriptions, we may be able to give the National Association some direction when we come to meetings or when we have these commission sessions, and so on.

I think this is one of the biggest problems we have. We are not clear even on our own campuses where we are going, and our presidents are confused, and when they get on the national level they are further confused when they meet together. So I think I would plead for closer institutional discussion of this situation. Particularly, I am interested in the training area.

I think we have to keep in mind too one other point,

and I think that is we have to think in terms of priorities. Which things are the most important? When we are going to have this discussion in the next two days here, I think one of the things that the Inter-Association people have to get together on is: Which are the areas that we want to concentrate on first? Which are we best prepared to concentrate on? Where do we have the best ability to concentrate? And I think we ought to not spread ourselves too thin by going in too many directions at the same time.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Carl.

DEAN GRIP: Before coming here I had put down a few notes which reflected some concerns that had bothered me over the year, partly as a consequence of a few trips to Washington, but in some two hours of discussion with Mr. Dennis prior to this meeting some of these concerns are obviously of no great importance now.

What I would like to do is talk instead about one man's perception about the present status of NASPA, vis-a-vis some of these problems.

I think one of the most eloquent things that has happened to NASPA happened last week when these 200 educators convened at the White House, as Mr. Dennis just mentioned, and when the only persons representing student personnel work and higher education on a topic which to the extent it affects higher education comes directly into the purview of the dean of students' office were Arthur Hitchcock and Professor Dugan, APGA.

I do not think that the future of higher education rests in the federal government, but I do think that important things are happening there, and I think that it is eloquent that our Association and our profession has not until this time usually been represented on the scene when discussions take place when national policy is formulated, whether that policy be the product of federal legislation, or, as is more often the case, the product of national discussion in various associations and so on, leading to practices that become universal.

I would like to suggest some of the steps that NASPA might take in our concern to remedy this.

I would like to propose that we should be concerned to remedy this because we either are going to be in the position of, as deans on our own campuses, playing an increasingly passive role after events have taken place, or we are going to be prepared to participate, and I do not think participation is easy, and I do not think it is a matter of meeting once a year and passing some resolutions. So let me suggest two or three steps which I think are incumbent upon us, if we are chagrined about our present status and if we are

honestly concerned to do something about it, because I think the initiative must be with us.

We have tried, in Tom Emmet's group this year, and in the Commission on Financial Aids, to do, in a sense, a pilot study of the way in which our Association might take a more effective role, and we have found this: That when we want to address ourselves to an issue of national importance such as financial aids, or the training of personnel workers, that, first of all, we need money in order to get people together regularly during the year. Secondly, we need selected personnel on these committees, and these must be people, one, who have experienced themselves in the relevant area, and, second, they must be people who are willing to do a tremendous amount of work, because it is not only the work of attending day-long sessions, and working hard during these sessions, but a great deal of preparation must be done beforehand. I think the members of our Commission, for instance, have received, over the course of a year, probably several thousands of pages of documents, including various federal bills, as well as a good many memoranda summarizing issues that were to come up in our discussions.

Now, the second thing -- and this means then that the dues increase in NASPA, the making available of more money to our various task forces, and carefully picking our personnel on these task forces, and getting people who are willing to put in a great deal of time, is tremendously important. But I think that there is a second issue which is of equal importance if we are to make progress, and that is that NASPA is, as Mr. Dennis has pointed out, but one of some 30 organizations in the field. I think we would like to think that we are sort of a central organization, in that most of these other offices tend, on most campuses, to be within the purview of the dean of students' office. But the fact is that these other organizations are independently organized, and when the federal housing legislation was written, and in the Advisory Committee to the FHA that meets regularly to review the program, the representatives to those committees that considered this in the Congress, and to the housing organization now, include representatives of the student unions and of the housing people. They do not include deans.

In the IACC, at the APGA meetings, there have been long discussions during this past year, about the future of student personnel organization. There have been from various quarters proposed new types of umbrella organizations. People within our organization have suggested that NASPA might become an organization having branches for these various specialties. This same suggestion has been seriously discussed in some quarters of ACPA.

I think at this moment it is obvious in both organizations that there is no inclination to move toward one or the other organization becoming an umbrella. But this then begs for the moment the problem that we have of cooperating.

Tom and I think that we have set something of a pattern this past year, by trying to work through the Inter-Association Coordinating Committee, and, for instance, in the Commission on Student Financial Aids, we have representatives from ACPA, from NASPA, from the Collegiate Registrars and Directors of Admissions, and from the newly formed Financial Aids Officers Association. We expect this fall, at our next meeting, to have representatives from the Business Officers, and the American Association of University Legal Counsels.

Where this leads us, I do not know, but it seems to me that the one thing that is quite apparent is that at this moment the ultimate solution is not clear, but the problems are very pressing and the time is short, and we have to dedicate ourselves, in the immediate future, to not simply being concerned about these things but to accomplish something in these areas and having something to present.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Ed.

DEAN WILLIAMSON: I would like first to say that I find myself in complete agreement with the point of view concerning inter-group relationships that Mr. Dennis has spelled out for us, as being desirable from the standpoint of some degree of consensus-taking, with regard to the planning of the future expansion, at least of our part of higher education. He used the term "coordination" with regard to viewpoints and expressions of desirable steps, both at the local, at the federal level, and at the national organization level.

I would like to ask him if he would elaborate a little bit more about the content, or the form that coordination should take in his viewpoint.

Now, let me ask whether or not he means that, as I thought he implied at one point, that as far as Congress is concerned it is highly desirable that education speak with one voice. Does this point to the desirability of unity of a point of view, and, if so, from the Congressional point of view -- and this is a technical advantage, I can see -- what does this do with respect to the great American doctrine of diversity, of institutional missions and points of view, and to the desirable diversity within the institution with regard to points of view and needs and plans?

CHAIRMAN SMITH: It is all yours.

DIRECTOR DENNIS: I think this is certainly a key question, although we do run, occasionally, a risk of allocating diversity or the idea of diversity to something that really does not exist. I think you are familiar with Jack Darley's research on institutional diversity and the fact that in many areas it is really more of a myth than a reality. But having said that, recognizing the importance of

diversity in the American higher educational scene, and recognizing that it is on the principle of diversity that the whole higher education system has been developed, I think what I mean then by coordination is that even though it takes more time and energy and patience and dollars to have the points of view thrashed out, and the bases touched when there is a major national question at issue, that nonetheless, the higher education community owes it to itself to see that the dialogue goes on within its own ranks before expressing policy statements to the Congress or the Executive Branch of the government.

Obviously, there are going to be times, perhaps many times, when there is not going to be unanimity, or where there will be agreement on some things and disagreement on others, and that is as it should be.

The fact of the matter now, however, is that the Congress tends to throw up its hands in dismay when they face the educational community, this vast panoply of organizations, and tries to get any policy guidance on some fundamental questions.

Let me give you an example, from what some of us were talking about at lunch -- the matter of scholarships. In the early and middle 1950's, representatives of institutions and organizations from higher education were pounding on Congressmen's doors in Washington, and pounding on the President's desk and saying, "You have to have a federal scholarship program." They were advancing studies to indicate why this was so.

Someplace in the dialogue within higher education, and during the 50's, some organizations did a 90, or 180 degree turn, and the priorities were reassessed; and instead of scholarships at the top of the priority list we find, and there may be wisdom in this decision -- I am not commenting on that itself -- but we find that the higher education community is pressing for federal aid for facilities, as well as federal aid for fellowships and assistantships, so that really the classrooms and the teachers to go in the classrooms are given priority over the students, or over financial aids to students.

The Congressmen who have been tracking this problem, such as Senator Morse and Congressman Powell, and others, to name the leaders of the two committees, tend to think that higher education is capricious in the way it approaches its long-term problems, as the Congress is accused of being. So this leads to such a responsible man as Senator Clarke of Pennsylvania saying to the American Assembly, two years ago this spring, to get our house in order, when we speak on higher education. He said, "We do not understand why it is that there must be so many positions taken on so many fundamental educational questions. Give us some order of priority.

Help us understand what you think are the most important things so that those of us who are sympathetic to the cause of education in the Congress will have some guidelines around which we can build policy."

I think that this is probably the same kind of problem that faces other organizations, other segments of our society, but you know, for all the internal problems that the American Medical Association must face there has never been much misunderstanding of where the American Medical Association has stood on two or three fundamental questions with regard to the federal government. With all the confusion that we have in the American business and industrial community, there has never been much misunderstanding as to where the U.S. Chamber of Commerce stood on two or three major items that it regarded as being of overriding national concern.

Regrettably, in the agricultural community we see the diversity of voices carried on its extreme with the Farmers' Union here, and the Farm Bureau here, and the Grange someplace in the middle, and as a result we have either no agricultural policy or an agricultural policy that is written from year to year according to the whims of the farm bloc in the Congress.

There is going to be education legislation either in this session, if the civil rights matter can be solved, or in the next session. The American Vocational Education Association is going to get funds for vocational education, even though it may be vocational education that is already 30 years out of date, but they have perfected their voice to the extent that there is never any question about who has the ball. And this is what we are talking about. Somehow, there must be some way so that the American Council on Education and the National Education Association, and all of the groups, associations and organizations can come to some kind of an agreement on those things that count the most, those principles that count the most; and then keep out of the public domain, the area of Congressional action, those matters which are really only of narrow concern to a segment of our constituents.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Thanks, Ed, that was a good question, as you know.

DEAN WINBIGLER: According to my watch, Mr. Chairman, I have minus fifteen seconds on this time limit that you set. (Laughter)

CHAIRMAN SMITH: I am flexible.

DEAN WINBIGLER: Let me try to make a couple of comments in a hurry.

This panel this afternoon has suggested to me that

we, as student personnel administrators, are confronted with the necessity to do something that we usually do not consider has been our business, and this is to go into the business of advocacy. As individuals, whether we admit it or not, we have been advocates, I suppose, day by day, in a very important way; but we are rather unaccustomed to the business of being advocates as a professional organization.

Mr. Dennis was very discouraging, to me, at the outset of his talk in suggesting that really the way to do this would be to hire a lobbyist, who would get his pants pressed at the same place as the minority leader of the Senate. (Laughter) But this might be an opportunity, and I think deans of students are properly opportunists, and we are going to have to look for opportunistic ways to get the job done.

I am impressed with his suggestion that we have a major job to do in trying to integrate and coordinate the many voices and many different viewpoints on our own individual campuses, and I suspect that many of us fall short in this responsibility -- not to work for a monolithic voice for the campus, because I think we have to accept the inevitable characteristic of the academic mind, and the academic mentality, represented by, I think it was Ambrose Bierce who said: "A professor is a man who thinks otherwise;" and this is one of the conditions with which we just have to work.

But I also think that if NASPA can find ways and means of developing an effective voice, it can also find effective means of making this voice heard.

If there is a moment, I would like to ask one more question -- which is, I guess, more or less of a shop talk question -- of our speaker.

When ACE sets about to determine its position on a policy -- now, I assume that with these 1500 constituent individual members, and scores of institutional members, there is a little bit of a moral problem when ACE speaks with one voice on something, as to what method you take to be sure you are representing fairly the various constituencies, and that probably you go at this on somewhat of an ad hoc basis. But do you have any secrets you would be willing to share with us about the method that ACE undertakes to determine its position on a policy of federal importance?

DIRECTOR DENNIS: First of all, negatively, to repeat what I said earlier, I think we have tended to be too mindful of our institutional constituency, and not too mindful of our organizational and individual constituency in the past. Having said that, the Commission on Federal Relations, which is made up of college presidents representing the large, small, public and private institutions from all regions of the country, has a panel of consultants that

includes all of the educational and related organizations with Washington offices, that it draws into its discussions prior to preparing statements such as this one that we issued last January on higher education as a national resource, which pledges support for what has come to be the administration's program on higher education.

We are concerned, as I know many of you are, with the fact that it is not always possible to have in that rather large panel of consultants, which number some 30 to 40 people, all of the organizations, and there are times when the Commission on Federal Relations has to rely on the judgments, let us say, of consultant A, on the assumption that he has been in touch with people who in turn might be within his constituency; so that when the American Council of Learned Societies, let us say, is brought in, we assume that the executive secretary of that organization has somehow touched base with the physical and biological sciences, as well as with the social science people, and so on.

We recognize that there can be an unfortunate breakdown in communications right at that point, in which the consultants themselves may not have been as representatives as they should have been of the broad area with which they are concerned.

I think with reference to student personnel services, that this is a problem that NASPA, ACPA, need to face in terms of your relationship with APGA. I know that the leadership of that organization are mindful of this, and as I understand it, some attention was given to this problem in Boston, so that from now on there would be some kind of a certainty that on matters relating to higher education, that whoever was brought into such a panel would be a person who would represent higher education.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: I think we should take a moment for comments and questions from the floor. Only a moment. Keep them short, and keep the answers short. It is now twenty-five minutes of. We are dealing, to some extent, with the fact that is it more important to be agreeable than right. (Laughter)

So it is twenty-five minutes of, and we will take about five minutes. Unless you really mean it, don't say it. (Laughter) Are there any questions?

DEAN ARNO HAACK (Washington University): You just talked us out of it. (Laughter)

DEAN BEATTY: After all those encouragements, I will speak anyway. (Laughter)

I do not think this organization represents the

whole college, and even though it does in a way, it has to speak through other voices besides its own, and we might as well recognize this very sensibly. I know that we do on our own campuses, and I am sure that we ought to here.

I do have some very modest suggestions which I shall make quickly and sit down. One is that I think NASPA ought to regularly and consistently be certain that there is somebody who represents the academic deans of the universities and colleges, a person chosen with as much insight as Dr. Gould was representing the presidents, who understands the work of the personnel officers, to speak on the program, because the more we develop this kind of liaison and linkage with the academic deans, the stronger and more sensible and more established our voices are. I believe this deeply and thoroughly, and I do not apologize for saying it, and I do not say it apologetically in any respect. I mean it, and I am not afraid to work with academic deans at all. I think this is a real need.

Two, I think there is a real need in this organization to pay attention to getting more persons from different institutions in this country who are not members of it and who do have noticeable voices in the press, and they are not all in this room. They are not all in this building. And I can name some of the institutions. I just finished, in the last fifteen minutes, going through the list of institutions represented here, and I can give you some very notable examples that are missing that should be here.

Three, and then I am through, I think it is important, from time to time, for the program planners of this convention -- and they do an excellent job and I am not criticizing them at all -- to be sure there are persons on every year's program who represent positions of high influence and power in the federal government. Indirectly, certainly, influence is reflected on this organization if this organization knows enough of the right people, and in an intelligent way. And I am not talking about apple polishing. If you associate with people of influence and power, who may not be a bit better than ourselves in a number of respects, but they are certainly in positions from which we can learn a great deal, and I think we almost grouse -- I do not like to use the word -- but we almost come near grouching because nobody is listening to us. Well, why not invite some of the persons in who should hear us? And why not have them on the program occasionally during the year?

My five minutes are up. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN SMITH: Good point, Shelton. Very excellent. Any other comments?

Do you have any fantastic remarks to end with, sir?

DIRECTOR DENNIS: No, sir, you have told all my stories today.

CHAIRMAN SMITH: I would like to thank you for what I consider a very interesting discussion. (Applause)

... The Conference recessed at three-fifty o'clock ...

CONFERENCE BANQUET

Thursday, June 27, 1963

The Conference Banquet convened at seven-ten o'clock, President Clevenger presiding.

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Ladies and Gentlemen, will you all please remain standing for the invocation by Father Victor Yanitelli. Vic.

FATHER YANITELLI: Eternal God, pour forth Thy joyful blessings upon this, our happy gathering, so that our union with each other may reflect the bond that unites us to Thee, our Heavenly Father. Pour forth Thy grace into our hearts so that our thousand daily tasks concerned with the precious potential of this nation's young men and young women may be inspired, enlivened and made real by a total commitment to Thy love.

Enlighten our minds that we may guide and be guided clearly according to Thy eternal purposes. Strengthen our wills that we may live by and communicate an inner core of hardness which is the total commitment to self discipline, to honor, to integrity, completely free from the fear of what others may think.

Bless our nation with the intelligent use of freedom. Bless all our dear ones present and absent, our living and our dead. Amen.

... Dinner was served ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Ladies and Gentlemen: On behalf of the officers and of the members of this Association it is both a privilege and a pleasure to welcome all of you to this Forty-fifth Annual Conference Banquet. I use this term loosely because it has been said up there that perhaps we should call this "operation shoehorn." (Laughter)

We do appreciate your indulgence with us as we face the problem of gathering this group in this rather small dining room. As all of you men know who have been with us these past three days, this has been a hard working and a busy conference, and we are gathered here tonight to relax, to break bread together, in the true spirit of friendship and brotherhood and camaraderie that characterizes this Association, but more important, I think, we are here tonight to hear one of America's top young statesmen, who by coincidence is a former dean of students. (Applause)

First of all, I would like to introduce the ladies here at the head table, and as a matter of public relations for Clevenger, I think it would be appropriate for me to first of all introduce my roommate and coach (laughter) for these past 26 years, Valeria. (Applause)

Down the table is Mrs. Don DuShane, wife of the Dean of Students at the University of Oregon. (Applause) To my right we have Mrs. Jim McLeod, the wife of our host dean. (Applause) On down the table, Mrs. John Gwin, the wife of our Vice President, from Beloit. (Applause)

Every fourth year we schedule these annual Conferences during June so that you can bring your wives and children along. This week we have been graced by the presence of these charming wives, and now that I have introduced these women at the head table, how about all of you wives who are in the audience standing so that we can give you a hand. How about it? (Applause)

As you know from the introductions we had at our opening session on Tuesday afternoon, some of our guests were present for that first session, and a good many of you were introduced in absentia. We are delighted that you could be with us this week. We hope that you have found it to be a pleasant and profitable experience, and we are delighted that you could be with us.

Will all of you who are here as guests representing associations, or representing the Inter-Association Coordinating Committee please stand and be recognized? All of you who are here as guests. (Applause)

During these past three days you have heard Clevenger take quite a ribbing from the members of the Executive Committee about Task Force No. 22, and Ad Hoc Committee No. 13-B, but I want to tell you that one of the great privileges of my professional life has been my association with this Executive Committee for this past year. In spite of all the kidding, this has been one of the finest team efforts that I have ever had the privilege of participating in, and in spite of all the kidding, when that ball was loose, it was amazing to me to see the manner in which these men grabbed this ball and ran with it. My primary job as President was to keep out of their way.

It has been a great group. The team work, the good fellowship, the momentum that this group developed was a source of tremendous satisfaction to me personally. This has not been the President's Executive Committee, this has been our Executive Committee. It is my pride and privilege to have been a part of it.

I want to introduce these men once more, if I may. Many of you were not present at the first session Tuesday afternoon, and I want to identify these men again for you, for their great contribution to this Association and its on-going program. Will you fellows please stand, and let's hold applause until they are all standing together, and then let's give them the hand they deserve.

Our two Vice Presidents, first of all Jack Gwin,

Dean of Students at Beloit. Remain standing, please, Jack, Father Vic Yanitelli, now the new Director of Student Personnel -- don't get us wrong at this -- at St. Peter's. (Laughter) In case you are wondering, St. Peter's is a very fine Jesuit institution in New Jersey.

Jim McLeod, our President-Designate, served with us this year. Glen Nygreen, our Conference Chairman of the past three years, Vice President-Designate, Kent State, and now going to New York City to Hunter College. Mark Smith, our Vice President-Designate, my chief critic, (Laughter) Dean of Men at Denison University.

VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: Get out of the hole.
(Laughter)

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Our devoted servant of the Association, Carl Knox, our Secretary-Treasurer, Dean of Men at the University of Illinois.

And I want to make special mention of this next man. This fellow has been on the half-run since Friday. He has not taken a deep breath. How hard he has worked, and how much we appreciate his efforts for this Conference, and all that he has done. O. D., you have done a great job, and we thank you for it.

Our Executive Committee also included Fred Weaver, the Past President who is secretary of the University of North Carolina. I am sorry Fred could not meet with us. John Blackburn, Dean of Men at the University of Alabama, and Vice President-Designate for 1964-65. Tom Broadbent -- did Tom get back? Tom had to leave this meeting because of a death in the family. Tom is Dean of Students at the University of California at Riverside. Bill Cheney, Dean of Students at Springfield College. That great bundle of energy, Tom Emmet, Dean of Men at the University of Detroit. Where is Tom? (Laughter) In more ways than one, Thomas. (Laughter) Philip Price, Director of Student Activities at New York University. Fred Turner, our historian, former President of the Association, and you all know about Fred. This next man I want to make special mention of. I guess we had better not have him repeat some of those stories of this morning. (Laughter) Where is Shorty?

DEAN NOWOTNY: I'm standing up. (Laughter)

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Shorty, you stay up there. Come on.

... Laughter as Dean Nowotny stepped up on the platform ...

PRESIDENT CLEVINGER: Shorty, I tried to say some things about you the other morning but you were not present. I am sorry you were not.

From the hearts of all of us, thank you, sir, for your great service to this Association, for your great job down through the years, and for your service these past twelve years as our Placement Officer. Dick Hulet is going to be our next Placement Officer, taking over at the end of this Conference.

Ladies and Gentlemen, this is our Executive Committee. I am proud of them. They did a great job. (Prolonged applause)

I would like too to pay special recognition to all these wonderful people who worked so hard in connection with this Conference and who, up to this point at least, have had little credit for their efforts.

Is Bob Crane here? Bob, stand up there, will you? Bob had that fine book exhibit. He got in here Saturday and was at that desk all through this week and helped in such a tremendous way. Bob, thank you very, very much. (Applause)

To our Publicity and Press Coordinator, the Director of Information Service at Northwestern, Mr. Norbert Hildebrand, we thank him too for his service to our meeting.

One person particularly -- this gal did a tremendous job for us through these warm days of this Conference. She was there early; she stayed late. Carl's secretary down at the University of Illinois, Mrs. Virginia Drake. Virginia, stand will you please? (Applause) Thank you, Virginia. We appreciate all your efforts.

Last year you know we made Leo Isen an honorary member of this Association. Leo has done a tremendous job for us down through the years. He is one of us. Here he is pounding away on that stenotype. Leo, stand up and take a bow, will you. (Applause)

To our Host Deans here at Northwestern, to Jim McLeod, to Joe Miller, to Miss Thrash the Dean of Women, to Henry McAdams, the Dean of Men, and to Mrs. Jessie Robertson, Administrative Assistant to Jim -- we know how hard you worked. Will this group stand so we can give you a hand? (Applause)

We know who does the work around this place; we know. Thank you very, very much.

I think Mr. Willard Buntin, the Director of Housing, is here. He had much to do with this Conference. Is Willard here? Willard, thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. A. V. Capillo, Assistant Director of University Housing, is Mr. Capillo here?

The Assistant Dean of Women, Mrs. Yearley, who worked there in Allison. She was there Saturday when we arrived early, and she has been there all week and worked with us very hard. Mrs. Yearley, thank you very much. (Applause)

You know, we wonder a bit about how relaxed President Flemming is out at the University of Oregon. I honestly feel that there should not be any threat in this situation of having his Dean introduce his Governor. (Laughter) After all, the legislature, Governor Mark, did finally adjourn, and understand you have now approved the University's budget, right? And we hope, therefore, that President Flemming will not be too concerned back in Eugene, Oregon, about this business of his Dean of Students introducing his Governor.

We ask Don DuShane, as Senior Dean in Oregon, if he won't introduce our speaker for us. You all know Don. Don, the honor is yours, sir.

DEAN DuSHANE (University of Oregon): Thank you. Jack, Ladies and Gentlemen, Friends: I guess that is an inclusive enough term. Before I introduce our speaker, I would like to introduce a charming lady and her son, Mrs. Charles Percy, and her son Roger. Mrs. Percy and her husband have been hosting Governor Hatfield during his visit to Chicago, and we are fortunate to have them with us tonight. Mrs. Percy and Roger, would you stand up? (Applause)

Now, Mark, in introducing you, I could start with a story. You all know about the party of anthropologists who went out to the South Sea Islands, and got involved with a king with a golden throne, who learned unhappily that you shouldn't stow thrones in glass houses. (Laughter)

There is another story I heard the other night about a second party from a university which went out to the same South Sea Islands, and the natives were somewhat less friendly this time and, having been cannibalistic by heritage, reverted to type and took care of the university expedition. But like many emergent nations, they were admiring of the United States, and they sought to emulate the free enterprise system, so they took the late university staff members and put them on the menu at the local Hilton. (Laughter) The menu showed fillet of anthropologist, \$2.25. They had not quite gotten hep to Hilton prices yet. It showed ragout of sociologist, \$2.15, and so on down the line to the last item among the entrees, Sirloin of Dean, \$15.00. One of the patrons, looking down the menu, objected strenuously to these prices, saying, "For heaven's sake. This is outlandish, to pay \$15.00 for a piece of dean." To which the head waiter replied, "Sir, did you ever clean a dean?" (Laughter)

As I said, I could introduce our Governor by referring to him as a clean dean. (Laughter) Or I could introduce him conventionally with a story of his life from his

boyhood as the son of a railway blacksmith, and a country school teacher, on through his education with a Bachelor's degree at Willamette University in Salem, a Master's degree at Stanford where he was, by the way, a resident assistant to our Shelton Beatty.

I could say that he is a member of Beta Theta Pi, (laughter as Governor Hatfield applauded) that he is a political scientist, that he taught political science at Willamette as a faculty member, across the desk from students who were not problems but students, and later he was Dean of Students, who saw them across the desk as problems as well as students.

I could say to you that he has seven honorary degrees, including one from Whittier College this month. I could cite his war record in the Navy. I could tell you about his charming, lovely wife, who was one of my favorite students. I taught her in political science at Oregon the second year I was there. I could go on and point out that he was with a small boat in the South Pacific which was not sunk. (Laughter and applause)

I could refer to his political career, from State Senator from Gilliam County two terms, Senator for two terms from Oregon, at which time he left his deanship for politics, as Governor of Oregon, re-elected for a second term in a Democratic year by a bigger margin than he had the first time, and that this political career was not furthered by any brothers or sisters, but only by his charming wife. (Laughter)

Or I could forsake that conventional kind of introduction and use the one I propose now to use. (Laughter)

Several years ago I went to Willamette to talk to a fraternity chapter there, and I had a half hour before I was due over at the House for dinner, and I wandered around the campus thinking about how I could find an appropriate way to open my remarks to the students of Willamette. I found a sun dial out in front of what would be called Main or Center Hall in practically any established college in the country, which had on the four sides of it wise words, "sagacity, audacity" -- I do not remember the others. "Obstinacy" was not one of them. (Laughter) I thought about that; then I thought about the motto of Willamette. Every good college, every university has a motto, sometimes in English, more often in Latin.

So I looked up the motto of Willamette University, which is our speaker's Alma Mater and the institution with which he was affiliated when he rose in the field of education and government. You know it is a darned good motto: Non Nobis Solum Nati Sumus -- a little more lengthy than some. I will repeat it for you: Non Nobis Solum Nati Sumus, "We are not born for ourselves alone."

It is a good motto for a college. It is a good motto for a Dean. I think it is a good motto for a public servant or a political leader, the consciousness that we are born for ends greater and beyond ourselves.

It is with this introduction, which I think is particularly appropriate for a young man who has made a career of service to his education, his church, and service to his country and his party, that I want to introduce Governor Mark Hatfield.

... The audience arose and applauded ...

HON. MARK HATFIELD (Governor, State of Oregon): Those are the nicest words that a Phi Delt ever said about a Beta. (Laughter)

Dean DuShane, distinguished leaders of this fine Association, Personnel Officers and Directors of great institutions of learning, ladies and gentlemen: About a year ago, Dean Jack Clevenger called and asked if I would attend and speak at this meeting. I said, "I would be delighted to, but what if I don't get re-elected this November?" He said, "Well, we will invite you anyway." Then he said, "Because, after all, you were a former dean and I think you might find it an enjoyable experience to visit with some former fellow deans."

I must say that with those words and the invitation that he extended, I grew a little nostalgic about the former relationships that I had across State Street because, you see, in the City of Salem, Oregon, which is the capital of our state, we have one of our main thoroughfares called State Street. On the south side of State Street is the beautiful Willamette University campus. On the north side of State Street is the state capitol group.

We have had a long-standing dialogue between Willamette University and the State of Oregon because the university was there before the state came into being. It has served as a great challenge to many of our young students to walk across the street and to observe the State Legislature in session and to engage in in-service training and on-the-job training, which had been worked out between the university and the State of Oregon.

I am sure that Willamette University and the State of Oregon in this relationship is not exclusive nor is it entirely unique because with the great highways, the great transportation systems we have, we are bringing a closer physical relationship between most of our institutions of higher learning, both private and public, and our governments, whether they be local or national. And it is that subject that I would like to visit with you for a very few moments this evening. We need more extensive dialogue between educational or the academic, and the political or the governmental.

This is not entirely a matter of public higher education because the service that this dialogue could perform, in some instances, might better be performed by private institutions of higher learning, but I am sure that you recognize with me the greater demands of numbers of students entering our institutions of higher learning and the constant increase in budgetary needs, together with government's relationship to the space age, demand a stronger system of communication in order to appreciate, define, and perhaps evaluate the respective roles of these two great institutions: education and government.

I suppose a meaningful dialogue would start with a self-examination on both sides of State Street. What is each prepared to contribute to the other? What are we on the governmental side of State Street prepared to contribute to education? And what is education ready and able to contribute to the cause of government and our free political systems and institutions?

I would say (as a college trustee and former Dean of Students) that I expect the college would say, "We are prepared to transmit to the youth entrusted to our care and to our tutelage the accumulated wisdom of the ages. We are prepared to conduct basic research that will push back the frontiers of knowledge."

And as a Governor and former Legislator, I suppose that government might say to education, "We are prepared to support, to the extent that our resources permit, the provision of educational opportunities for all, for all of our young people. We are prepared to defend the freedom of the academic enterprise, subject to certain basic policy decisions about numbers to be educated, the nature of special offerings, and the level of academic excellence that can be afforded."

But I believe there is much more than this that is needed and demanded at this time from both sides of State Street. I would say that especially in this day in which we live there are some matters that have been unattended, perhaps by both sides of State Street, that have been neglected and that need immediate attention.

I think we can say that government expects of higher education greater efficiency of teaching methods. It was Grayson Kirk who said that the format of higher education has not changed notably since the medieval age. And as we look about us today we find that we are still performing these roles and responsibilities in moulds that were established years and years ago. The Monday, Wednesday, Friday sequence of class, meeting at nine a.m. in the morning for three hours of credit, or the two unit course of Tuesday and Thursday at nine a.m. in the morning for two hours a week; the fact that we have not addressed ourselves many

times in education to looking at new techniques, updating our methods.

It was Alvin Eurich who gave a very challenging speech in which he said, in effect, that if American education is to provide the physical plant facilities that will be needed for anticipated enrollments, we will have to build in the next 15 years more facilities than we have built in the total history of higher education in the United States.

He further went on to say that even if the economic resources were available, he was not certain that it would be well to continue in the present format of educational facilities.

Very challenging comments, yes, by a great educator. Have we utilized the full extent of television? What are we going to do about keeping pace in our library facilities? Here were suggestions, specifically, which were made by Alvin Eurich. He said it is foolish to build great, monumental library buildings. We cannot provide the space necessary to keep up with the growing body of knowledge that we have; but rather, we should look in the direction of greater use of film, with libraries in miniature. Have we utilized the kind of television lecture in which the student would be able to go to the library of lectures by the finest men in the field, take from that library the lectures in all subject matters, play that lecture on his own portable TV set, in his own dormitory room, which would then obviate the necessity for increasing classroom buildings because, as Alvin Eurich intimated, classroom buildings will soon become a thing of the past?

These may be radical thoughts, but at the same time this does not eliminate the need to at least think along lines of change, to obtain greater efficiency in our educational techniques.

Have we been able to translate from education to government the fact that research will be immediately beneficial to the state and to the regional economy, and that in the intense technological competition that now exists as between regions that education is the key for economic growth?

We, in our state, have been confronted with the great problem of diversifying our economy. Oregon has one-fourth of the standing virgin timber of the entire United States. We are the largest timber producing state in the Union. The second major factor of our economy is agriculture; and the third is the tourist industry. You can immediately see that the three basic factors of our economy carry a basic similarity of being highly seasonal in character, which calls for the need, long past due, of diversifying our economy. In analyzing the direction in which we should move toward this objective of diversification, it became very obvious that we had a highly educated labor force, represent-

ing a higher than national educational background and number of years completed in school. It also came out in the analysis that we had certain other natural resource benefits in our area, but the real and the true key to our economic diversification project was the role that education would be able to play.

Taking this message to the business community, it became necessary then to gain their support. But I submit to you that for too long a time the cause of education, the battles for educational programs have had to be carried by educators when actually the total society is the beneficiary.

We feel now that we have built a broader base of support for education in our state through governmental action, by relating the very economic prosperity and the economic development of our state to the halls of our educational institutions.

I feel, too, that there is another need that must be met by our institutions. Government can expect assistance in offsetting the over-simplifications about government and politics that hold sway over many minds. Educational institutions have this responsibility and opportunity of destroying the myth that politics is necessarily dirty, or that it is something that can be left to the politicians.

Here, of course, is an area that has lent itself, by the action of many politicians, to ridicule and to the continuation of this myth.

I am reminded of a very interesting epistle that was written by the prototype of the "politician," who was asked the question in a public meeting, "How do you stand on liquor?" and he responded:

"I had not intended to discuss this most controversial subject at this particular time; however, I want you to know, I take a firm stand on every issue, regardless of how I feel about whiskey. (Laughter) And, brother, here is where I stand on this burning question. If you mean the devil's brew, the poison scourge, the bloody monster, the defiler of the innocent, that liquid that dethrones reason, creates misery and poverty, yea, literally takes the bread out of the mouths of babes, if you mean that evil concoction that topples Christian man and woman from the pinnacles of righteousness and gracious living down into the bottomless pit of despair and degradation, shame, helplessness and hopelessness, then, sir, I am against this brew of satan with all my power.

"However, (laughter) if you mean the oil of conversation, the philosophical wine and ale that is consumed when good fellows get together, (laughter) that puts a song in the heart and laughter on the lips and a warm glow of

contentment and wellbeing into the eyes, if you mean the Christmas cheer, if you mean the toddy that puts a spring in the old man's step on a frosty morning, if you mean the drink that enables a man to magnify his joy and happiness, or forget his debts and life's other tragedies, heartbreaks and sorrows, if you mean that drink, sir, the sale of which pours into the treasury untold millions of dollars (laughter) which are used to provide tender care for little crippled children, (laughter) our blind, our pitifully aged and sick and infirm, and to build highways and hospitals and schools, then, brother, I'm for it." (Laughter)

I am sure that many politicians have contributed much to this prototype by their actions, by their positions; but I believe, with you I am sure, that there is a desperate need of mobilizing, of recruiting bright, alert young people with integrity, with dedication, to the cause of public life; and I believe that it will be out of the genesis of their educational experience that they will develop the attitudes, the ideas about a possible political career.

There is no single thing, I believe, that is in greater demand today from our educational institutions than to provide the manpower, the womanpower, to man these important public positions. I think we have a responsibility in the field of education to help offset the attitude of spectatoritis, as I term it, the attitude of "no involvement," of isolation from public issues, from public problems. We need to get these people, both in and out of our institutions of learning, out of the grandstands down onto the playing field.

I am proud to say that there is no inhibition in the thinking of any of our educators, public or private, in the institutions in our state, to so participate. The chairman of my opponent's campaign committee was a professor at Portland State College, and he still had the job after I was re-elected. But there were many who felt that there would be political repercussions if academic staff members took positions in public life, in political campaigns. I believe this is no longer true. I believe that you can set the example. I believe if we had more people from education as activists in political life, in party organizations seeking out qualified people to serve, giving leadership to political parties, this would do much then to create the impression, an attitude of higher respect for public life on the part of our students.

Then I think there is a growing danger today of extremism in political thinking. I have made the statement that fascism is here; it is here today, it is here in America every bit as much as is communism. But whether it is the lunatic left or the radical right, we have the need for clarification, for definition of political philosophies and political dogmas. When I see evidence of action and thought

which are contrary to the American way of life, I must speak out, you must speak out. One cannot be blind to the reality that there are extremists on both sides of the political spectrum; and I am sure you realize that they are as rotten apples in a barrel. Though their present strength may not be of great significance, the poison they spread can contaminate the whole community in which they exist.

I have reference to both sides because I believe there is the presence of both sides. I, personally, abhor extremists under whatever guise they may parade. We have those of the far left who are constantly parading under the guise and under the flag of false peace. They are willing to let America be weakened by banning the bomb, by unilateral disarmament, by "better red than dead" philosophy, and other indefensible slogans. This does not mean that there are not sincere, but misguided, people who follow behind such leaders, espousing their causes. But it is time that they were awakened to the fact that they are being used for purposes hostile to their own survival.

The far right oftentimes will disguise itself under super-patriotic banners with high-sounding phrases of patriotism and anti-communism. Again, many sincere, but misguided, individuals follow along, giving support to these groups which are spreading radicalism.

I am sure that you agree with me that not a week goes by that you probably do not come in contact, of some kind, with some of these groups. My office receives pamphlets, letters, tracts, all sorts of publications. They advocate racial and religious bigotry, peace at any price, or the so-called "plot of international Jewry." Just recently we received a publication which stated that the Jewish financiers were running this country and that they were simultaneously under the domination of Soviet Russia.

Just this past few months, we had an example of the arrest of two fascist leaders for desecrating a Jewish synagogue in Los Angeles, and we have had a Jewish synagogue desecrated in Portland, Oregon. We have had vicious attacks made upon Catholics, upon Negroes, Orientals, Mexicans, Mormons and Masons, just to name a few, who have been the objects of bigotry.

Again I say that this is a cancer that would destroy the American dream and emasculate the strength that we find in our diversity.

I do not believe that strength can be developed out of fear. I believe that America's strength is going to be determined by her faith, her faith in the constitutional form of government, faith in our spiritual concepts, faith in our free enterprise system, and faith in the idea that all men are equal before the law. And there are those who would use the sincere and dedicated and very often ultra-conservative-

minded people to further their own fascist causes, as I am sure there are those who would use sincere and dedicated people to further their own communistic cause.

But, ladies and gentlemen, this is a day that calls for analysis and focusing of attention upon such groups and exposing of such groups by the intellectual communities of our nation.

I think further that higher education ought to expect certain things from government in conducting this dialogue. First of all, I think that higher education can expect and should expect a defense by government against the anti-intellectual, those who would use education as a whipping boy. And I might say that one of the toughest campaign arguments that I had to overcome when I first stood for public office, back in 1950, was the statement made frequently by some of my opponents, "Why, he has never met a payroll. What does he know about running government? Why, he's nothing but a college professor, and you know what college professors are like."

The fact that I had an academic standing at the time became a detriment in the political community, and yet, there was little being done by many people, in or out of government, to counteract or counter-balance this attitude. I am convinced that government must be the defender of the intellectual community both in terms of attitudes and in terms of policies.

I think higher education could also expect clear cut decisions by government about the quality of higher education desired, and no manipulation of student-teacher ratios that do not clearly acknowledge the impact on the quality of education.

I do not know if you have been through what we in Oregon have been through of late, but 141 days of siege was laid to the capitol building by the convening of the Oregon Legislature. And you know, I might say that it has almost made me believe in two-branch government, the Executive and the Judiciary. (Laughter)

But we had the experience of asking for a certain budget for higher education, and we had to use the traditional measurements, and I might point out here, within the family, that these measurements are archaic and that higher education has to come forth with more accurate measurements. But until we do this, we were using the measurement of student-teacher ratio to build our budget. But the legislative mind conjured up the idea that you could raise that student-teacher ratio from 16 to 1, to 17 to 1, or to 18 to 1 and get the same quality of education, but have X number fewer dollars contributed to the budgets of higher education, manipulating the standards of measurement.

This, I believe, is doing a violence to not only a budgetary measurement, but it is not upholding the responsibility that government has to education, and that is to be honest, to be forthright in their budget preparations and in their appropriations.

I think that government oftentimes forces education into certain budgetary controls and purchasing controls that should not exist. Educational institutions are different than other state agencies. They do not lend themselves to the pattern of administrative procedure that the average, typical state agency may represent; yet, we have found a reluctance on the part of public officials in our state to recognize this and to set education into a different mould. I think that education has a right to expect government to look upon it for its own unique character, and to set its administrative policies in accordance.

In all of these things that I have attempted to outline to you -- and there are many others that could be discussed -- I think that the key to all of these respective problems and issues comes down to the question of communication. Are we talking the same nomenclature? Are we on the same frequency? Are we actually communicating our needs, our problems, and our solutions?

I submit to you that there is a weakness in this dialogue that we need to strengthen from both sides of State Street. We must discuss our common concerns with complete candor so that education and government, in partnership, may assure the achievement of the educational, the economic and the cultural progress that is essential to the continued greatness of this nation. This, in essence, is the purpose of the dialogue I propose. Whether it be across Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, or across State Street in Salem, Oregon, we must seek, in the method of Socrates, the answers to the questions that do embrace our very destiny.

... The audience arose and extended an ovation to The Honorable Mark Hatfield ...

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Governor Mark, from all of us, and from our hearts, we thank you, sir, for this wonderful and thrilling message. You know, in all my years in NASPA, I just want to say this, how flattering it is to all of us to have a busy, chief state executive take time away from his heavy responsibilities to meet with us and to give this kind of help to us as we pursue our course to do what we can to help America develop a more effective system of higher education.

Last year we decided at our first Executive Committee meeting in Philadelphia that we would invite the Governor to address us on this occasion, and when I got back to Pullman, I immediately called him. I thought I would have to go through about six secretaries and quite a

procedure. I was surprised when he picked up the phone and answered it. I extended the invitation and without a moment's hesitation he said, "Jack, I'd be delighted. I would consider it a great privilege and I will be there." And he has been with us.

Mark, it has been a great experience for us, and we thank you, sir.

You know, we are about to conclude this Annual Banquet. There is a traditional ceremony of passing the gavel. Jim McLeod, would you please step up here.

I must admit in all candor to all of you here tonight that I pass this gavel to Jim with something of mixed emotions. I am a soft, sentimentalist. This experience as President of this Association has been one of the truly great experiences of my professional life to date. It has been a wonderful thing to me personally, and I want to say thank you to all of you for permitting me to have this wonderful experience. I am a soft, sentimentalist about it.

Jim, this gavel that we pass on to you is a token of our esteem, of our appreciation for you as a wonderful person. It is a token of real responsibility, as you carry forward the hopes, the ambitions, and the dreams of this Association. It is a heavy responsibility, and we wish you well in it. Our friend, Father Yanitelli, has a wonderful way of ending all his letters with this salutation, and I pass it on to you, Jim, as I pass you this gavel: Keep wonderful!

... Applause as the gavel was presented to President-Designate McLeod and he assumed the Chair ...

PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE McLEOD: Thank you very much, Jack. It is a good thing it is not Mark Smith, or it would be from major to minor. (Laughter)

I accept this gavel and the responsibilities that go with it with a good deal of trepidation, but with more enthusiasm than I would have had sometime ago, because it is just about eleven years ago that I had to make a decision, with great reluctance, to leave the University and College Chaplaincy to become a Dean. I had had lots of ideas about deans up until that point. (Laughter) I still have some. (Laughter) And I think I had a good deal of nostalgia, after a life spent in that particular role on college campuses, reluctance that I was now losing an opportunity to associate with a group of men who were dedicated, consecrated, and sincerely believed that they were doing the most important job in the world in guiding the spiritual and moral destinies of young men and young women.

After my first meeting with NASPA I had no more regrets for in that first meeting I found camaraderie

friendship, dedication, consecration, a certainty of a group of men and women who had given of themselves fully, whole-souledly, unstintingly, unselfishly to young men and young women in the most crucial, eventful, and destiny-making days of their lives.

Thank you, Jack. Thank all of you for the opportunity. (Applause)

It is only fitting and proper at this time that I announce the new officers and the Executive Committee of NASPA.

The first one I would mention, who immediately becomes a member of this new hard-working committee, is J. C. Clevenger, Past President.

Now I would like to introduce the other officers and the members of the Executive Committee, and with "Shorty" leaving his important job and no longer needing Mark Smith as a guard and a helpmate, may I introduce Mark Smith, Vice President. Will you stand, please, Mark. No applause please until I finish introducing all of these people. They haven't done a thing yet. (Laughter) Next year you can applaud. Mark is from Denison University. Glen Nygreen, Vice President, Dean of Students, presently at Kent State, soon to go to Hunter College.

President-Designate Victor R. Yanitelli, and I won't forget this S. J. (Laughter and applause)

Vice President-Designate, John L. Blackburn, Dean of Men, University of Alabama.

Vice President-Designate, Robert Etheridge, Dean of Students, Miami University.

Executive Committee: J. Donald Marsh, Assistant Dean of Students, Wayne State University. James J. Stewart, Jr., Dean of Students, North Carolina State. O. William Lacy, Dean of Students, Trinity College. A. T. Brugger, Dean of Men, University of California at Los Angeles. William Toombs, Dean of Men, Drexel Institute. Jorgen S. Thompson, Dean of Men, Augustana College, Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

Still staying with me and with all of us, Carl Knox, Secretary-Treasurer, Dean of Men, University of Illinois. And that hard-working Conference Chairman who continues for two more years -- I know he is ready to quit right now (laughter) -- O. D. Roberts, Dean of Men at Purdue University.

And always the helpmate, the guide, and one who gave me my first lessons on a long trip from New York as I

sat at his feet for four hours, Dean of Students, Fred H. Turner, University of Illinois. (Applause)

This will be your team, gentlemen, for next year. We will need your prayers, your help, your blessing. Now may I announce -- and I know they are delighted to hear this -- the old and the new executive committees will meet promptly at 10:15 in the library, Allison Hall, 10:15. That will give you plenty of time, Mark. (Laughter)

This concludes our meeting. May I say another word of gratitude for the fine former Dean of Students, the present Governor of Oregon, thank you, sir, for an excellent address and inspiration to all of us.

So I shall use the gavel for the first time. The meeting is dismissed. (Applause)

... The Conference Banquet Session recessed at nine-twenty o'clock ...

THIRD BUSINESS SESSION

Friday, June 28, 1963

The Conference reconvened at nine-ten o'clock, President-Designate James C. McLeod, Dean of Students, Northwestern University, presiding.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: Gentlemen, the Third Business Session will please come to order.

By the manner in which you seat yourselves in this auditorium I feel very much at home. I have preached in many churches. (Laughter) You are widely scattered and nobody is down in front. But we will not begin with prayer, but we will end with one.

Our agenda for the morning is the result of a two-hour session on the part of the Executive Committee last night -- perhaps two and a half to three hours would be a better description. There are some committees and sub-committees which should report to us at this time. I would point out that in the event your Chairman becomes somewhat confused, Don DuShane is in the audience, and he is the Parliamentarian, and has been for some time, of NASPA.

I will ask Glen Nygreen to report on the Sub-Committee on Publications. Glen.

VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE GLEN T. NYGREEN (Chairman, Sub-Committee on Publications): President Jim, I am happy to report, on behalf of the Executive Committee, the recommendations of the Publications Committee Sub-Committee, Ad Hoc Committee of the Executive Committee, with regard to our next steps. This is simply a report. You will recall that yesterday we indicated that we were proceeding with the development of a multi-page quarterly newsletter with a publication schedule beginning in November.

We have some considerable number of problems to work out, so what we have decided to do is to appoint a Publications Committee consisting of some twelve members of the Association, a number of whom have expressed in writing to our President a particular interest in this activity and who have some particular skills to offer.

Mr. Tom Emmet of the University of Detroit will serve as Editor until the next annual meeting, at which point we will have some publication experience behind us, and we will at that time designate a new editor.

The Committee will consist of the three members of the Executive Committee's ad hoc assignment, with Bill Cheney being drafted foreign correspondent from deepest Liberia, plus Phil Price of New York University, Vic Yanitelli of

St. Peters, Whit Halladay of Arkansas, Dick Siggelkow, State University of New York, R. R. Oglesby of Florida State, Ron Barnes of Iowa State University -- that is at Ames -- Carl Knox, our Secretary-Treasurer from Illinois, Jim Kreuzer from Queens College, S. J. House from the Newark College of Engineering, and Bob Crane from the University of Illinois.

We hope that the next time we report we will have some more complete plans and at least a beginning record of publication. That is all, Jim. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: You are not making a motion?

VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE NYGREEN: I do not think any is necessary.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: No motion is called for at this time. It is a recommendation to the Conference from the Sub-Committee on Publications.

We are grateful to Glen, and even more so to Tom Emmet for taking on this additional task, but knowing his parapatetic habits and his ability to get around, I am sure this will be the kind of publication that will cover the country.

Next on our agenda is a report from Commission VI, by Carl Grip, the Commission on Financial Aids. Carl.

DEAN CARL M. GRIP (Chairman, Commission VI, Temple University): Those of you who were at the meeting on Financial Aids yesterday morning, or at our panel discussion with Larry Dennis yesterday afternoon, heard some of the results of the activities of Commission VI in those meetings. What Commission VI has done this year, the Commission on Student Financial Aids, has been to try to do a job in the field of financial aids and also to act in another sort of experimental fashion in attempting to devise ways in which this Association would do a number of things. One is to participate rather vigorously in the national discussions in this field. Secondly to bring the information that was of value in this field back to the deans on the campuses. And I have a feeling that as a result of the dedicated work of the members of this Commission we have made some progress.

I would like to try to, in about three minutes, summarize what I think some of the implications are, some of the things that we have learned in this particular Commission this past year.

The first is we have found that we had to develop what we called a task force technique. Tom Emmet has been using the same technique with his group on the training of student personnel workers. We had to get people who could meet frequently during the year, and we had to get people who

were willing to do some preparation before these meetings. For your information the members of this Commission have received, and this material has been sent out by various members of the Commission, some thousands of pages of documents, pamphlets, legislative bills, and many dozens of pages of summaries and interpretation that were prepared by members of the Commission.

The second thing that we have learned here was that we are one of the many associations in the field of student personnel work and that any serious effort on the part of this Association to take a position or to participate in these kinds of discussions requires an open door and a close kind of cooperation with other Associations. In this instance, this has meant that, on the one hand we have worked closely with the American Council on Education, with the Association of State Universities, and in some instances with the Association of Higher Education; and on the other, with our fraternal organizations, such as the American College Personnel Association, the Association of Registrars and Admissions Officers, the new Midwest Financial Aid Officers Association, and now we are working with the business officers and the legal counsels on a fall meeting, in which we will discuss some problems that we have not had time to get to as of now.

One of the serious implications of our efforts this year was that we found that in order to do a job we had to meet four full days, and this required that NASPA put more money into this Commission's activity than had previously been put into the budget of any Commission or Committee in any single year. I think that this is one of the strong arguments for the dues increase which will take place a year from now, that if we are to follow the example that we have, I think, found to be successful in this particular area and enable task forces or commissions in the other areas to do the job they ought to, they are going to have to have money to get together and money to travel.

For your information, I want to say this on behalf of the Commission members, we had to do two things. One is we were not able to invite all members of the Commission to the two two-day meetings we had. We did not have enough money. So, in a sense, we had an executive committee of the Commission of about six people. The selection of the six people here was done on the basis that these were the people who had done a great deal of homework and preparation and had reports to present at our meetings. We also had to ask these people to pay about half of their expenses, so the various members of this Commission who served this year have, at the expense of their own institution or of themselves, paid about half their travel and residence expenses for these meetings.

You received in the mail a complete report of the Commission, and I would like to call your attention to just

two or three things.

The Commission has considered a great many problems. Some of them affect federal legislation. More often they affect practices within financial aids offices. There is a certain drama to taking a position on federal legislation at this time. There is far less drama when we sit down and contemplate our own practices. So I would like to draw your attention to some parts of our report in which we have addressed ourselves to the institutions about the country. For instance, we have said that while we are asking for an expansion in the NDEA and the continuation of that program, we notice that there are some very serious problems on the campuses. We know that the Office of Education is extremely concerned about the number of schools where colleges are falling behind schedule, about the number of schools where individuals who have previously borrowed cannot be located. So we have made a series of recommendations which we hope you will scrutinize carefully which call upon our member institutions to accept the responsibility that they have to make these programs work effectively. I hope you will take the time to read this report.

Yesterday we had the happy experience that at the conclusion of the panel discussion on financial aids we asked those who were in the audience and who had heard the reports of various Commission members and who I hoped by then were very much aware of the amount of time that was involved, we asked for people to volunteer for membership on the Commission, and I am delighted to say that a substantial number of the people who were there did volunteer, and this, I think, is pleasing, because it was obvious that these people were willing to do a great deal of work during the coming year.

The President says I should move that this report be accepted.

DIRECTOR PRICE: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: The motion has been made and seconded that this report be accepted. Is there any discussion?

VICE PRESIDENT GWIN: Jim, I was at that meeting yesterday and I think there was information there which should reach the entire Association. I do not know whether minutes were taken or whether it was recorded or not.

DEAN GRIP: We have the paper by Playe and a paper by Stalnaker, and I am giving them to Carl. They will appear in the convention proceedings.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: Did you all hear what Carl said? The papers by Stalnaker and Playe and the proceedings of that

seminar will be placed in the hands of the Secretary and be distributed as part of our publication, the Breeze.

Any further discussion? I will call for the question. All those in favor; opposed. Carried.

I would like to comment on this report. Those who served on the Executive Committee, and have been part of it for a couple of years, are thoroughly cognizant of the vast amount of hard work and energy which Carl Grip has put into this. Its significance to the organization is pretty transparently clear. It is one of our great concerns and one which must continue to be a concern. Our action is that we continue to support this Commission in its future activities.

I will now ask Dave Robinson, who was Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Place of USES in College and University Placement Services, to make that report.

DEAN DAVID W. ROBINSON (Chairman, Ad Hoc Committee on the Place of USES in College and University Placement Services, Emory University): President Jim, we called this the Clevenger Ad Hoc Committee 28 report, (laughter) and I really had to look at the subject of vanity to select the number 28, perhaps because it represents this day of the month, which has some significance in my mind because 39 years ago it started. (Laughter and cries of "Happy birthday")

Let us go on. I also had a few thoughts and trepidations about whether or not I should speak in a southern accent. Most folks down Georgia way say that the only difference between a Yankee and a damn-Yankee is that a Yankee goes back north. You remember Hebe Rece, who was with us for many years before he went back to the bible and religion department full time. Before I went to Emory four years and a couple of weeks ago, he said, "Dave, you'll have to remember that here in Georgia we'll consider you a damn-Yankee until you've been with us for four years. After that we'll call you a Yankee, but don't expect us to do any better because, really, it takes several generations to get that damn blood out of your veins." (Laughter)

About fourteen or fifteen months ago President Clevenger asked me to chair this ad hoc committee. I had been in placement for a five-year period, back in the 50's and had pretty much been out of it in recent years. His admonition was very simple. In essence it was that there had been a lot of reports that the U.S. Employment Service members chose to expand their functions rather widely into the college placement field. He wanted a committee made up of placement directors and personnel deans to study the subject. As the result of our study, we were asked to give whatever resolution or recommendation or report we so chose to give.

The Committee did not meet as a committee, but

virtually all of us met each other at conventions, and the mountain of correspondence that went out among us was something I had not anticipated. I do not think I would have accepted your invitation, Jack, if I had known the work I was getting into.

Yesterday we had a panel, a presentation of the subject. Perhaps the best thing I can do, President Jim, at this point -- and I will presume that each person has read this little Ad Hoc Committee Report which Carl Knox has sent to all of us several weeks ago, and other copies were distributed yesterday, and yet more copies are available at each end of the stage today. In case there is discussion or if there are questions in the minds of our delegates today, what I would like to move is the acceptance of the resolution of this Committee, and if you would like, I shall read the resolution, but I would like to move officially for acceptance to the floor, and then any discussion which might follow would probably be appropriate.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: It could prove to be a dangerous procedure, Dave. How many of you have read it?

... Most of those present raised their hands ...

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: Are you willing to have us now take action on it without the reading of the report?

... Cries of "Read it" ...

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: Will you read the resolution?

DEAN ROBINSON: The NASPA Ad Hoc Committee appointed in May 1962 by President J. C. Clevenger, consisting of Walter M. Bristol, Director of Placement, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington; Frank S. Endicott, Director of Placement, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois; Howard H. Lumsden, Placement Director, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee; Charles A. Meyn, Dean of Men, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania; Ray G. Mock, Director of Placement and Relations with Industry, College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota; Mrs. Geraldine M. Wyatt, Director of Placement, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware; David W. Robinson, Chairman, Dean of Student Affairs, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, unanimously submit for approval -- and have previously submitted for approval of the Executive Committee-- that the convention this year accept this following resolution:

"WHEREAS, we believe the responsibility for vocational testing, counseling, and placement of college and university graduates rests primarily with the educational institution; and

"WHEREAS, we believe that in general college and university administrators support this view; and

"WHEREAS, we believe American business, industrial, educational, and governmental agencies are effectively served in the field of college placement with the aid of college placement office staff; and

"WHEREAS, we believe opportunities are available for American college and university graduates to consider and be considered for varied vocational opportunities in government, education, industry, and business through the existing college, governmental, and commercial placement offices; and

"WHEREAS, we believe the involvement of the United States Employment Service in the college placement field would not contribute to the solution of the current national problem of unemployment;

"NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators oppose any future governmental legislation or expansion of regulations in existing governmental agencies which would provide for the recruitment, testing, counseling, and placement of college and university graduates, professional or otherwise, in relation to employment by specific companies, agencies, or organizations."

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: That is your motion?

DEAN ROBINSON: The motion, therefore, is that the resolution be accepted by this Convention.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: The motion is that this resolution be accepted by the Convention. Is there a second?

DEAN NOBLE HENDRIX (University of Miami): I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: Any further discussion?

COORDINATOR WILLIAM BANAGHAN (Southern Illinois University): I feel that there is inconsistency in the manner in which the State Employment Services have come to various campuses or have offered their services on campuses, and I think there is much support that is due; however, I request the statement to the effect that the employment services now available in this country are adequate for professional personnel. I feel that although we do have the State Employment Services, and related to the federal, of course, the college employment services, we have private employment services, and we have professional employment services, such as our own organization and a few others, I doubt very much whether these things are adequate at this time. The proposal, as I view it, seems to imply to me that there can be a restriction of any further legislation even including that for the employment service off campus.

In other words, if the whole group of us decides

that we want to go down to the State Employment Service, and if they cannot handle us, or if they choose to decide upon other facilities to assist us, that a proposal such as this would be restrictive in that area, not only in the area of on campus. And in this manner, I would oppose the proposal.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: Thank you. Any further discussion?

DEAN RIGGS: Dave, would you comment on the question as to whether, under the existing statutes and laws, there might be such expansion. It appears to me the resolution says that it goes on record opposing further statutes or laws. Does it also include the interpretation of present law to get into this field?

DEAN ROBINSON: What is on the law books now is quite enough, according to the impression of this Committee. What we refer to specifically is the Wagner-Peyzer Act of 1934, I believe is the correct date. The Act enables the USES to serve on college and university campuses. We, as a Committee, do not say NASPA should stand on its collective hind legs and fight this whole law.

Perhaps we need to go back a moment. A logical question would be that if this law has been on the books for 17 or 18 years, why is all the fuss made now?

I grant that this report is brief, but I personally believe that reports like this should be brief. It could be much longer. We tried to capture in the report the essence of an action made by USES in April of 1962. It is cited in here. I summarized and, I hope accurately, paraphrased the essence of this publication, which encouraged, to the point of virtually insisting, that the state employment agencies aggressively move to extend their services to college placement on the campuses. Many people in college placement work have objected to this. People in business objected to it. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce got into the act. USES came out in January of 1963, also cited in this brief report, and in a sense overrode the April '62 aggressive type statement by saying, in January of '63, state employment agents, cooperate as you will and as you see fit with the colleges and universities in your state. Those administrators who would like to utilize the services of your office, by all means, give them the service within the limitations of the law.

In essence what we hope we have captured in this resolution is strong encouragement that the attitude continue in USES to be one of cooperation rather than one of insistence.

To imply that the resolution, or a NASPA acceptance of the resolution would be a rapping of the knuckles of the

USES people would be really wrong. If you and your college and university utilize USES services and find them satisfactory, well, our blessings to you. Our belief, as represented in this Committee, is that the decision should rest with the college and university administrator. This was not implied in the April '62 statement. It was in the January '63.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: Thank you, Dave. Any further discussion? If not, I will call for the question.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: Before you move to that, Chet Peters is with us. Chet, I wonder if you have anything to add.

Chet is Past President of the present Council. He testified in Washington, D.C. when he was there. Can we ask for a word from Chet?

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: Would you like to come up here and face the group? It might be easier for them to hear you if you come up here.

DEAN CHESTER E. PETERS (Kansas State University): I will make this very brief, but to start with, Dr. Foltman, yesterday, made a presentation in our panel, and I would like, for the record, to comment on just two items, which are all I picked out, that I would like to take extreme exception to.

He has indicated that the college placement council officials have led an aggressive campaign to force the public employment services withdrawal from all service to college students. This is absolutely untrue and unfounded. There is no correspondence which says this, in any manner. We have gone on record that we do not believe an expansion of on campus facilities is warranted or necessary. Our concern has been that the resources of the federal government, which come from you and from me, should be used where the great problem exists in unemployment, and not in the placement of professional personnel. This is one issue at stake.

He also said one other thing which I would take extremely strong exception to. He said the CPC is right in at least one respect: There has been a failure of communication between the council and the public employment services, but he said communications between these organizations will continue to be futile as long as CPC insists that it has a total solution to the professional manpower problems. There is absolutely, again, no indication in any correspondence that we have ever made this sort of a statement, and we would be wrong to make such a statement.

Communications have been unilateral, in my opinion, and I feel this very strongly, in the correspondence and work we have had with the administrator of the U.S. Employment

Service, the Director of the Bureau of Employment Security, and the Under-Secretary of Labor Hennings, and also correspondence with Secretary of Labor Wirtz. We cannot communicate or sit down and develop a cooperative working program. And Dr. Foltman said yesterday that the federal government is not in a position to do this. They have a mandate, and they must carry out the mandate, and he is not interested, in so many words, in sitting down and talking about our mutual problems. This, to me, is a situation which I think has great concern for all of us. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: Thank you very much. Any further discussion? I will call for the question. All those in favor; opposed. It is carried. Thank you very much, Dave, for your report.

Are there any further matters to come before the business meeting at this time? We are definitely on schedule.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: You had a report from Vic on the Sub-Committee.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: The Secretary apologizes for not including you in the agenda which was given to the President. Father Vic Yanitelli, a report on the Committee on Student Housing.

VICE PRESIDENT YANITELLI (Committee on Student Housing): I am covered with confusion. (Laughter)

President Jack appointed Ted Zillman, from Wisconsin, Bob Chick, from Oregon State, Art Kiendl at Colorado -- when he was at Colorado -- and myself, to go into this business of the Committee on Student Housing. I wrote to these men in reference to the questions that President Jack was asking on whether we should appoint a permanent commission or committee to carry forward our interest in student housing; what our relationship to ACUHO should be; and then, what we should do with regard to mutual invitations to the annual conference of NASPA had the annual conference of ACUHO, and the Committee sent me their recommendations. I synthesized these -- I hope -- and sent them back to the Committee for their approval and presented this to the Executive Committee with this result:

That we should appoint a permanent committee that would concern itself with the student educational facilities. This is the substance of what the committee ought to do. That in order to get a proper definition and function for this committee somebody should be given the task to do it, and Glen Nygreen was appointed to delineate the work of this sub-committee, which would come up in the recommendation for acceptance by NASPA as a permanent committee on student educational facilities.

Are there any questions? In which case I recommend that the report be accepted.

PRESIDENT CLEVENGER: One more thing, Vic. One thing we would like to do, with the announcement of this new committee, is to ask for volunteers. We want to know those among you who might be interested in service on this committee. We visualize it -- as you can see, my original concept of it was concerned with student housing, but the committee studied this, and the Executive Committee, and they felt we should go further than just student housing, into such things as physical plant, student unions, and other such facilities, and we earnestly seek volunteers for this committee. The Vice President for Committees this next year is Glen Nygreen, and any of you who want to roll up your sleeves and go to work, who think this is an area where you might enjoy doing some work, if you feel you can make some kind of contribution to all of us deans, get your name in the hat with Glen Nygreen.

VICE PRESIDENT YANITELLI: I regret omitting that most important coda to my report.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: You have heard the motion. Is there a second?

DEAN WINBIGLER: I second the motion.

DEAN BEATTY: May I say that I would like very much to see us consider seriously making sure that in addition to having some relationship to ACUHO we take considerable care to get a well selected architect -- more than just an ordinary architect -- to work with any planning we do. There are architects and architects, just as there are deans and there are deans. There are good things to be had from working with a very intelligent and perceptive architect, in the planning, for instance, of student residence halls.

I should like to make as a second comment on this proposal that I doubt very much if this group is going to have a great deal to do in its influence on a great many buildings on the campus. I should like to propose that we keep in mind the tremendous importance of emphasizing above all other buildings, and I mean above the union also, the student residence hall, because humane living of human beings is very important, and we are entering a period in the next ten or fifteen years in which enormous numbers of residence halls and rooms will be built, and I am very much concerned at the increasing pessimism among American college students, and I think part of it is due to a lack of privacy, and part of it is due to not being able to discover themselves or to have enough humane relations with college professors and deans and enough experiences in a residence hall to avoid being lost as if in some vast hotel.

I do not believe that we are paying as much direct,

sharp attention as we ought to the study of the planning of residence halls, and I do not for one minute mean simply studying somebody's house system.

I should like to recommend strongly -- and I represent 60 persons when I say this, from a seminar yesterday morning, who agree that we would like to bring to the attention of all of us the great need of having regularly on the program of NASPA not only a seminar for discussions of the needs of students' residence hall planning, but some good architect or planning director who would work with us as well as representatives of ACUHO, if need be, but particularly that we keep emphasizing what are the distinctive ideas -- not just floor plans, but ideas -- in residence hall building and planning in the United States.

There are numerous new things being done and that have been done in the last ten or twelve years. I could name a good ten institutions with ease that have done something distinctive within the last ten years about housing. I know that there is a well-known housing study supported by a foundation which has many pictures in it, but the material in it is not organized by ideas. It is a welter of house plans and commentaries here and there, but nobody could tell, from beginning to end, what the ideas are, and I am very much disappointed that that study did not develop in that way. I think there is a serious need for us to pay attention to where students live. No more important remark has been made in this Association, since I have been attending it, and that is longer than since 1938, than Dave Harris said when he discussed the work of the dean in relation to human beings. We have been saying this again and again over the years. I maintain that where a human being lives and how he lives has a great deal to do with the kind of human being he is, by practice, and that we deans ought to be very much concerned about where students live.

I know there are many things we ought to be interested in, too many. Student residence halls ought never to be out of the focus of our study and our concern, and I would like very much to see every program we have for the next several years include some refreshing study of what are the special ideas that have been developed and what changes have been made recently in planning better student residences that identify a human being with the group, still provide privacy, but most of all, tend to make the experience of living in a residence hall somewhat educative and somewhat humane.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: Thank you. I am sure that most of us would certainly agree there are words of wisdom there and this must continue to be a concern of anyone who is responsible for the residences on our campuses. I do not know how far one has to go back to get what has become a cliché but ought to become a reality. A college has to be both a living and a learning experience, and it cannot be one without

the other.

We have a statement which Glen Nygreen would like to read at this time, with reference to this area, which is an additional comment.

VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE NYGREEN: President Jim, I would like to express to Shelton Beatty and to the members of the Association appreciation for his statement and to say that there is a forthcoming monograph in the ACPA monograph service by Hal Riker which, as I understand it, and I am not acquainted intimately with it, will deal with the questions of housing in precisely the manner in which he suggests.

It is because of the kind of thinking which Mr. Beatty's statement represents that the Executive Committee wanted a broad statement of purpose for a standing committee. And this is the statement which was adopted and approved as an initial assignment to this permanent committee. A committee on student educational facilities: A committee to study and advise on the educational purposes and functions of physical facilities designed to serve student needs. This includes housing, activity areas, offices for student services, and the planning and location of classroom and library facilities. It develops statements of principles for the guidance of deans and institutional planning officers and recommends to the NASPA membership specific factors in the provision of facilities which need continuing attention to meet changing personal and institutional needs.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: May I conclude that this statement is really included in your recommendation, Father Vic?

VICE PRESIDENT VANITELLI: Oh, yes, indeed.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: On that basis, I will call for the question. All those in favor of accepting the report made by Vic Yanitelli on housing; opposed. It is carried.

Since we are on schedule and our speaker for the next session will be here in ten minutes --

VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE SMITH: Before you end it, we have an announcement.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: O. D. would like to make his announcements following the speaker of the morning.

VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE SMITH: We have one.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: If this is satisfactory, this will conclude our meeting.

VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE SMITH: I have one. By "we" I meant "me."

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: You are big enough to be "we."
Go ahead. (Laughter)

VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE SMITH: There have been a lot of people who have asked about the procedure for indicating interest in serving on a committee or commission. I think Glen and I agree that probably the best way to do this, instead of these informal things being put in pockets all over the place, with the assumption that this will move on with it, is that when you get home, write to the committee or commission chairman with a copy to the Vice President, Glen, for Committees, me for Commissions -- just a brief expression of interest. This simply puts you on our books, and this is a year in which we really want to inventory interest in these groups. Let us formalize this a little bit so we know exactly what we do have.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: If you want to be on Glen's list or Mark's list, write directly to the committee or commission in which you are interested, with a copy to them. I will guarantee you they will put you to work.

Any further comments?

Do I hear a motion for a fifteen-minute adjournment, to return at that time to the auditorium?

... Cries of "So moved" and "Seconded" ...

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: Okay. Let us be on time, gentlemen.

... The Conference recessed at nine-fifty-five o'clock ...

SIXTH GENERAL SESSION

Friday, June 28, 1963

The Conference reconvened at ten-fifteen o'clock, President-Designate James C. McLeod, Dean of Students, Northwestern University, presiding.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: The meeting will come to order. I will call on Carl Grip, who will introduce our speaker of the morning. Carl.

DEAN CARL GRIP (Temple University): Jim McClellan and I have noticed that we are running behind time, so in order to reassure you that we will stay in our scheduled two hours, be sure to use those watches that you used on Wednesday and if you do, we will be through by 1:30.

When O. D. Roberts called me to ask whether we could get him for this session, he wanted to know whether I had ever heard him talk, and I had to admit that I had not, and I have to admit that I still have not. But he is a good friend of ours and I assure you he plays a mean guitar.

When his recent book on education in America appeared, it received more favorable reviews than I think any book addressed to the problems of education has ever received. As a matter of fact, Jim, I do not think that it was even banned by Admiral Rickover, was it? (Laughter) He says it was just banned by the National Review. (Laughter)

Jim hails from the state of Texas. He did his undergraduate work at the University of Rice in Texas, and took his Ph.D. at the University of Illinois. He taught at Florida State University and at Columbia, and we were happy to acquire him at Temple a couple of years ago. He is also one of those Americans who has been invited to participate and teach at the Salzburg seminar.

When we tried to arrange for him to appear here on this particular date we found that we ran into a very important problem because he was due up at Harvard today to teach for the summer session. So literally he is moving from Temple to Harvard for the summer, by way of Chicago, and will fly out of here this afternoon to go up there.

In these times of serious criticism about education and in these times of confusion by those of us in education, we are sometimes a little less than clear about where we are going and where we should be in a few years. It is a real pleasure to read the words of someone who seems to have a clear grasp of the kinds of changes that are taking place and to confront this change with a sense of excitement rather than despair, and to find in the proposals that he makes not the kinds of severity and the semi-scientific attitudes that

are apparent in some of the critiques of education, but the basic kind of humanity which so many of us think is the integral part of education.

So it is with a great deal of pleasure and anticipation that I present to you this morning James McClellan, who will speak on "Goodman's Community of Scholars: Education Without Tears?" (Applause)

DIRECTOR JAMES E. McCLELLAN, JR. ("Goodman's Community of Scholars: Education Without Tears?" Director, Department of Educational Foundations, Temple University): Dean Grip, Fellow Citizens of the Academic Community:

Try as I might, I could not begin this paper without a passing reference to Socrates, Anytus, and the assembly of citizens who condemned the philosopher to death. Despite your appalling collective title, you, like the Athenian jury, are a special body, charged with the high responsibility of protecting and perfecting the virtue -- in the Hellenic sense of competence, effectiveness, excellence -- of the most important portion of our youth, during the most important years of their lives.

Goodman, like Socrates, is a gadfly and a deeply compassionate lover of youth, firmly convinced that the traditional ways of growing up in our culture are, as he puts it, absurd. He is willing to make you angry, and to suffer the consequences of your anger, if only you'll listen and act.

That leaves the role of Anytus, the foul accuser. I suppose I have to accept the role, for I fear that Goodman is dangerously wrong in certain crucial points. I hope that I can convince you that Goodman deserves a serious hearing, but in the end, rejection. Mercifully, we do not give our gadfly philosophers poison; as Goodman says, we "swamp them with Time and Life."

But I wish I did not have to speak against Paul Goodman, for it is a mean and servile spirit that does not respond with affirmation to his writings. Through his pages, we see Goodman as a man, fearful and lonely and mistaken as all men are, at least sometimes, yet courageous enough always to speak the truth as he sees or feels it, however unpopular. Who else insists on everyone's knowing that the New York Times is a mere mouthpiece of the State Department, having betrayed its obligation to Truth in exchange for an inside line to all the managed news that Dean Rusk thinks is fit to print? Who else cares whether the New York Times prints the truth or lies? Who else calls the famed Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts "a pretentious and worthless commercial enterprise"? Who else writes on youth work camps without any of the covert hostility that most of us feel when we advocate picking youngsters off our city streets and setting them to useful labor? Who else can glorify man's desires literally

to reach the stars without ever settling back into the Cold War negativism that underlies our space efforts? And, above all, who else has the sheer effrontery to keep telling us that the ugliness, pettiness, misery, squalor, and sin of daily existence sustain themselves from generation to generation only because we haven't the will to destroy them.

Unfortunately, Goodman's very sincerity in writing may give the wrong tone and distort what he means. I discovered this in the summer of 1961 at the Salzburg Seminar where I directed a discussion group concerned with how American intellectuals regard American schools. We read J. D. Salinger, and Mary McCarthy, and David Riesman, and many others, including an article by Paul Goodman in Commentary, entitled "The Calling of American Youth." I used this piece as a typical expression of what may be called the rat-race-and-withdrawal theory of American public life.

Pedagogically, this choice of reading material was a mistake. The European students at Salzburg were perfectly willing to take Salinger, and McCarthy, and even Riesman as giving an expression of American life. But Goodman they took to be describing it. I wanted them to ask about each of these writers: Whence this particular viewpoint? How does it compare with a comparable viewpoint from a European writer? Etc. With others we studied, this worked well, but concerning Goodman's view the Europeans wanted to know only one thing: Is it true? Is American public life just a rat race? Partly this response derives from the striking intensity of Goodman's prose, partly from the perfect familiarity of the image of America as the land of the rat-race. Here is the way Solon Kimball and I described this image in Education and the New America:

The rat-race-and-withdrawal theory of public life is so much a part of the climate of opinion among contemporary intellectuals that its public expression cannot seem other than trite. They proclaim that the public world, the world of great corporate superstructures, is nothing but a rat race. The business corporations exist only to exist; mass advertising creates mass demand to consume the products of mass production, and so around and around forever, all to no purpose other than that the wheels increase in number and speed. Government structure is necessary to keep these business corporations from destroying one another domestically and to help spread their influence throughout the world before the (really quite similar) Russian corporate structures spread their influence throughout the world. The meaninglessness of the whole competition is nowhere better revealed than in the growth of gigantic military systems which, to justify their existence, will eventually blow the rat race to utter cosmic oblivion.

"Official" education, as received in school, through

the mass media, from pulpit, and White House make the rat race sound terribly important; it makes responsibility and authority in the corporate, public world seem exciting and worthy of attainment. But the "informal" education among the cognoscenti teaches that the only sensible style of life for man is to exploit easily acquired leisure and comfort, to build a private world in which to pursue self-cultivation until the system blows itself to pieces.

It does not really matter on this theory that television fare is generally inane, vulgar drivel, that urban redevelopment is creating habitation more fit for poultry than human beings, that the natural beauty of our continent is being destroyed with all deliberate speed, that the basic decisions affecting us as a nation are ever further removed from popular inspection and control, that compulsory education for a large proportion of our youth is nothing more than custodial supervision, that some public agencies, such as those responsible for transportation and mental health, function at the lowest imaginable level of efficiency -- none of these things matter very much since the whole corporate system is a rat race, and anyway there's nothing an individual can do about it. The system, moreover, does provide excellent opportunities for the individual to withdraw and seek his own self-fulfillment through music, literature, arts and crafts that may be pursued in the private world of the home and family. Here indeed, is the way of wisdom, the cultivation of one's own garden, as Voltaire so sagely advised.

And in the present world crisis, on the rat-race-and-withdrawal theory, the society must make certain demands on the individual in order that the system may be preserved. By a combination of force and fraud, it exacts as large a proportion of the individual's time and personality as it can; the individual resisting as hard as he can. By a kind of balance of tensions, depending on internal and external pressures on the system, a compromise is achieved between individual freedom and social survival.

The rat-race-and-withdrawal theory does account for many facts of public life -- the graft and corruption revealed daily in the press and the cynicism with which these revelations are greeted, the senselessly huge salaries paid to corporate presidents, signifying the absence of any genuine social reward for socially useful service, and so on. An individual can order his life on the premises of this theory, but he does so at the cost of violating the very realism and disillusionment he cherishes.

(In a footnote to that section, we referred to Mr. Goodman's article in Commentary and added the somewhat

patronizing comment: "The way Mr. Goodman describes the rat race is frighteningly familiar; however the world may actually run, surely this is a quite usual way of talking and thinking about it.")

In retrospect I think we were wrong on a number of counts. First, the particular statement of the rat race conception is not really very close to Mr. Goodman's account. In fact, it much more closely resembles that of David Riesman, who published an article on the same topic in Encounter almost concurrently with that of Goodman in Commentary. The cool note in our statement should never be confused with Goodman's deadly earnestness. Goodman can describe how "they" play the rat race cool but he cannot be cool about it himself and certainly he can never advocate coolness. He could never do as Riesman does instinctively: turn the whole thing over and show that while the hipster plays the system cool, the system is equally well playing the hipster. When we seemed to say that the rat-race-and-withdrawal theory of public life carried with it an advocacy of cool withdrawal, we should not have assigned that view to Goodman, though it may follow Riesman, whose "Junior Organization Men" are learning, and according to him not too dysfunctionally learning, precisely those habits of cool withdrawal which Goodman describes with poorly concealed horror.

Second, the other side of the coin, we should have recognized Goodman as a major figure among the critics of American education, particularly since the recent publication of his Community of Scholars, of higher education. For Goodman shows a rare and intuitive understanding of young men and women who must grow up into a world they never made and will likely never comprehend. His prose comes through most clearly when he talks about the socially and economically deprived youth. The things that are wrong in their lives are so deeply wrong that only major social surgery can effect any genuine cure, but at the same time there are numerous things that can be done to make life a little better for those who have it the worst. If we want to help, all we have to be is serious. On these matters, Goodman writes in nervous bursts of very busy prose. He is very serious.

But when he talks about college education, something happens. Our slums are horrible, but with seriousness they could be made a little more livable. Our colleges, however, are enjoying their most magnificent success in history. Just being serious about college education is what we already are--seriously concerned to build more buildings, hire more staff, get more money, and do other serious matters. Being serious is itself the major occupation of most university administrators I have ever known.

Goodman senses this. When directed toward higher education, his writing becomes sarcastic rather than ironic. At the end, as I want to show, we wonder whether even Goodman is or can be serious on this topic.

Many of his ostensibly practical suggestions are, indeed, practical. He would like to see student government either made, as he says, "for real" or abandoned. That, I believe, is an excellent idea. He would like to see student counseling and advising taken away from administrative deans and returned to the teaching faculty. That also, I believe, is an excellent suggestion, but concerning it I have one reservation, namely, me. (Laughter) I don't want to do student counseling as a duty, but only as a penalty for allowing myself to get cornered. (Laughter) You see, we cannot take many of these practical proposals seriously. They may apply very well in one situation but not in another. But, as Goodman himself once wrote about Kafka: "This is a very earnest artist; we must pay him the respect -- that critics, alas, rarely pay -- of asking whether what he says is true and freely said or false and miserable; remembering always that what may be false as a general aphorism may be true and necessary in particular." (Kafka's Prayer, p. 8)

As we turn, then, to Goodman's conception of a Community of Scholars we shall follow him in three major lines of attack:

- (a) By an ingenious play on the concept of human nature, Goodman makes us see in the faces of our students a most serious indictment of our bustling, busy, successful colleges. Here, I believe, is his most successful move.
- (b) By proposing a simple scheme of withdrawal as his so-called radical solution, Goodman shows that he doesn't know what's at the root of our problem.
- (c) Thus pushed, Goodman must come to grips with a basic metaphysical question. You may well foresee how he answers it.

(a) Goodman's conception of human nature is a compromise between two elemental and conflicting views that are equally endemic in the Western intellectual tradition. Using labels appropriate to our own time, we may call them the Freudian and Marxist views respectively.

Freud tended to look upon human nature as a fixed entity, its stages and development determined by the basic biological inheritance of the human animal. Cultures could and did interfere with this nature in various ways and degrees, but human nature was before culture, and thus, despite the penalties and privations man must endure as his nature is bent and twisted by alien impositions, human nature can never acquiesce in its subservience to cultural hegemony. In Freud's later work this becomes a doctrine of almost stoical tragedy and despair. In Rousseau it was a call to revolution. Goodman is influenced by both.

The view we may label Marxist regards human nature as a dependent variable rather than a fixed entity. "You are

what you eat" was once the title of a best seller in America, fittingly so. Americans are peculiarly susceptible to the hope that if we change our diet, or our laws, or our teaching methods, or our economic institutions, or our personnel practices, we can change our basic nature. Because we are what our environment makes us, we can ever hope and strive to become better -- nobler, stronger, wiser, happier, and more beautiful -- than we are. In Marxism, of course, this view of man as plastic possibility becomes a justification for revolution; in America it underlies such quite different reform movements as the eighteenth amendment and the last Supreme Court decision on educational segregation. In the philosophy of John Dewey, human nature consists, as he says, of "second nature," i.e., of those habits and dispositions acquired by social conditioning. Instincts, the fixed element of man's nature, Dewey views as so infinitely large in number as to constitute a vast well of potentiality rather than an entity that may conflict with social demands.

Between these two, Goodman steers a middle course. The overwhelming problem for those who assert the existence of a fixed human nature is to describe accurately in what that nature consists. Freud, for example, was forced to invent a thoroughly unsatisfactory and mythological trinity of id, ego, and super-ego, a scheme that could never have achieved the success it did, were not its competitors even less adequate. The problem for those who take man as mere plastic potentiality is to account for the inescapably normative element in any cultural description. There is something wrong with certain schemes of cultural order, e.g. that order described by Freud which aroused tabooed sexual fantasies, and then frustrated the expression of them and then punished their memory unceasingly. It is not enough to say that such a scheme may carry within it contradictions which will lead to its eventual destruction; what's more in point is that regardless of its longevity, or lack of it, such a system is contrary to man's nature and therefore wrong.

Goodman recognizes that any attempt to define precisely the elements of human nature will fail; he does not make the attempt. Rather he claims that we can recognize in the behavior of individuals when it is that they are forced to act contrary to their nature. When men and women are behaving in ways that violate their humanity, their behavior loses the "force, grace, discrimination, intellect, (and) feeling" characteristic of the human being at his best. The descriptions, says Goodman, are vague but accurate enough for education which is, after all, an art, an activity guided by feeling, ever responsive to the student's response. In teaching, surely, there is an immediately intuited sense of when things are going against the grain of human nature, when the natural flow of energy and creativity is blocked and unnatural demands substituted.

It is from this view, at-first-blush simple minded and completely unempirical view, of human nature, that

Goodman drives home his first line of attack on our current system of higher education. Traveling around the country, speaking with all sorts of students and professors, listening to them with a clinically trained and finely-tuned ear, Goodman concludes that by and large the student populace in the academic world has lost its grace, dignity, and purpose.

Most of the students perform as required. Some get satisfaction from the beautiful subjects and are patient about the conditions of learning. A few are cynical about their performance. Many are simply obedient, as they have been since childhood. But many who conform and perform because it is prudent and acceptable to do so, are embarrassed to explain themselves and are made anxious by interrogation, as if it did not stand to reason to do what is approved and profitable. More alarming are those who conform and take it out on themselves. There is a large consumption of stimulating and tranquilizing drugs, even more among the women than among the men; and there is a dreamy clique life of sexual hangups and endless self-analysis of the kind that discusses "I" and "you" and "how we relate" as if they were discussing third persons. Here is the breakdown of youth subculture and the onset of anomie.

Now what are we to say to Goodman on this matter? You are well acquainted with the constantly increasing research that is being done on the college student. You know how to make the facile reply: Oh, you cannot generalize so, Mr. Goodman. Very likely some college students are as you describe them, but surely not all of them are. And even if they were, are they so different from the college students of olden times? Francois Villon was not such a model of mental health, now was he? Just how different was the Beatnik crowd on the Left Bank in the middle of the fifteenth century from its present day counterpart in New York or San Francisco? History gives perspective; research makes one look at averages instead of individuals. You, Mr. Goodman, could do with a good deal of both.

And after we have mouthed these obvious remarks, what do we then say to Mr. Goodman? I think that we have to acknowledge the major thrust of his statement to be true. Goodman, primarily an artist, has captured what our curves and graphs almost invariably miss, namely the central tendency in the variables of spirit. Other artists have sensed the same thing. As my colleague Paul Komisar pointed out to me when we were discussing the works of certain young and competent novelists, there is a strange, silent complaint running through nearly all of them: "Father knew something terribly important, but somehow he didn't tell me. Maybe he forgot, maybe he couldn't tell me; worst of all, maybe he just didn't care enough to try. But he knew how to tell the difference between reality and illusion in the realm of

morals, and I don't know. And life will be living Hell until or unless I can grow up and learn it for myself."

This figure of Father is sometimes directly in the foreground, as Brenda's father in Phillip Roth's Goodbye Columbus, sometimes just off the canvas, as Rabbit's father-in-law in Updike's acclaimed first novel. In the later works of each of these two writers, the figure of Father becomes bigger and spreads out over several characters. Salinger's Glass family could do without a Father so long as Salinger was content to do what he can better than anyone since God almighty himself, that is, to grant a revelation into states of individual consciousness and interpersonal relations. But when Salinger wants to reveal his characters not just statically in a series of still pictures, however detailed and bewitching, but rather as growing from something and toward something, then a Father image begins to appear in the person of Seymour. Bernard Malamud's forlorn Levin was so utterly failed by his Father that before he can begin to find reality, he had to be born again, as the title A New Life would suggest. Significantly, Levin seems to inherit, along with the responsibility for another man's children, a touchstone by which to cognize the moral realities of this world. That is to say, Levin becomes a Father himself. Malamud's ending is incredible, but it fits this thesis beautifully. Only by a miracle can the young learn the moral world for themselves if Father fails to tell them. And most fathers fail.

This way of looking at things has further interesting implications. One could eliminate all references to race in James Baldwin's fiction and still recognize that his characters differ in a most significant detail from those of his white compeers. Baldwin's characters, particularly the men, are saddled with a host of debilitating illusions, but among them is not the illusion that Father was free from the debilitating of illusion. It is tempting to speculate that the new found power among Negro youth is not unrelated to this feature of their life. The success of the direct action protest movement is in inverse proportion to the degree of trust that college age Negro youth have in the power of the Supreme Court to be Great White Father and secure for them dignity and equity.

Now I mention these authors and their characters not primarily as evidence in support of Goodman's claims (although in a somewhat non-statistical sense of the term they do constitute evidence) but rather as indicative of the patterns of thought that college youth are likely to acquire in their sojourn in the intellectual community. It is not so much that these artists have accurately represented an external reality called "how college youth think and feel today;" it is rather that they present directly and creatively the patterns of thought which college youth can appropriate as their own. Goodman could never be a novelist of the contemporary college scene. But as a creative artist himself, Goodman can recognize the reality of the symbolic level. For college youth it is more correct to say that they are what they read than what

they eat. And their artists, those who provide the symbols to give significance to the flux of ordinary experience, create for them a generation which still looks to Father to resolve the metaphysical question, to tell them what is "really real," in Whitehead's expression. But those who hold the role of Father either cannot tell or will not tell. When Goodman travels about the country and talks to students, he senses this basic flaw in their conceptual scheme. He says it his way, but the sheer existence of what he is talking about cannot, I think, be denied. His interpretation and suggested treatment, however, are not immune to further criticism.

To sum up this argument so far, Goodman claims that there is an intuitively evident loss of grace, power, discrimination, intellect, and feeling in those human beings who are forced by their culture to behave in ways that violate their basic human nature. Why? Consider: It is one thing to be cast into a strange world to find one's way. This may destroy the weak, but it is a challenge that can bring out the best in the strong. It is quite another thing to be walking through a strange land alongside an older companion who holds what appears to be a map, one who seems to know where he is going, one who turns aside all questions, spoken and unspoken, with a grunt that may be interpreted as disgust, indifference, or incapacity to communicate. Our novelists picture youth in the latter condition. But human nature demands a map, a system of symbols by which to interpret and explain the world one is passing through. We have not given our youth such a system. More dangerously still, we have not cut them loose to construct one of their own. We have acted as if we had one concealed somewhere about us. In short, we have played upon our youth a cruel metaphysical hoax!

Goodman's first line of attack has achieved its objectives.

(b) If Goodman were an academic social philosopher, he would proceed from a theory of human nature to a theory of social structure, and from there to a theory of the college as a special institution, but Goodman cannot do this. What prevents him is not the lack of current academic affiliation but the fact that he is an anarchist: so far as I can tell, a thoroughly committed anarchist. This is a morally respectable position, I think. A normative social ethic might very well contain as one of its basic premises a statement to the effect that no one ought ever to have authority over anyone else for any purpose, that every instance of social cooperation ought to be voluntary as of that instance, neither creating nor depending upon precedent. Stated thus, the idea of such a society is very appealing, although I doubt that it could be defended in the face of really searching examination.

But that is not the central argument here. The

charge against Goodman is not that he advocates an ideal society different from the one we have. Nor even that he conspires and advocates the overthrow of our system in favor of the lack of system he admires. That is all quite legitimate, even if slightly ineffectual. No, the charge is that of impiety; here that means denying that our system exists and functions as a system. It may act in ways that are unpleasant; it may utterly fail, as we argued above, in the tasks of providing a system of symbols by which youth can interpret themselves in relation to the world around them. It may be vicious and inefficient, as well as humane and effective. But it is a system. It organizes energy on a vast scale; it coordinates an emotional pattern of rewards and punishments, by which human beings are conditioned to behave in determined ways, with a non-human energy system that provides a vast range of highly complex substances -- from edible proteins to stereophonic sound reproduction -- to be consumed, that is to be reduced to simple wastes, by these same human beings.

Such is the nature of any social system; what is so striking about our own is its size, the amount of physical power it constrains, the rapidity with which it changes both in behavioral and in material aspects, and the tolerance for variation in behavior which it permits.

Concerning society as a system, Goodman is trying to argue two different ways at once, and these two turn out to be incompatible. He wants to argue, first, that the basic moral flaw in the system of American society is that it exerts too much power over the individual, not allowing him to become the full person that he is capable of becoming. He wants to argue, second, that the way to overcome this deficiency is to ignore system altogether and establish a community of scholars outside its purview. But if the analysis of what is wrong is correct, then his solution is impossible. If his solution is possible, it's a solution to a different problem from the one he has analyzed.

Sensing his difficulty here, Goodman separates his proposed reforms into two parts: first the so-called practical proposals which it may be possible to put past the administrators and, second, his radical, simple, proposal that we create a leavening in higher education by taking out a handful of academic scholars, adding to them a sprinkling of non-academic "veterans" and allow these to gather unto themselves students and begin teaching. Here is the academic equivalent of the Kibbutz: as Goodman describes it in another connection, "this strength-giving creative community ... I mean the action of ... a simple communalism in the framework of vast State and Imperial structures, of financial connections with connections with distant bourgeois ..." (Kafka's Prayer, p. 35) And where but among academics might such a community be formed? Why is it also that Skinner's Walden II is basically a university? One can see a clear line from Communitas, that inspired primer on community planning written by Paul and his architect-brother, Percival Goodman, to

the Community of Scholars -- the accent denotes the emphasis.

I should like to volunteer here and now for a year's teaching duty in Goodman's Utopia. But I will go only as a form of personal indulgence. It would be fun, but in the larger framework, the gesture is futile. It will not leaven the loaf, it will not even give it season. It ignores the fact that the college today is a functional part of a social system that places some inescapable demands on it. Withdrawal may make it possible to see more clearly what those demands are; that's one function the university is supposed to serve. One reason we are here in Chicago is to withdraw enough from the adventitious features of our local situation to see what is required of us by the larger system of which we are a part. But to think that withdrawal in and of itself will alter the situation is patently absurd.

What precisely is the situation we are talking about? Let me begin the explanation by reference to a most interesting set of figures put together by James Coleman and published in the May 25th issue of The Nation.

Assuming a reasonably optimistic extrapolation of the current rate of expansion in the number of jobs available and knowing very well how many people are going to enter the labor force between now and 1970, one is able to see that for every new job available there will be an average of four new people looking for work. Some groups will be far below the average in opportunity for jobs: A Negro youth who drops out of school between now and 1970 will have one chance in eight of finding work. Other groups will be far above the average: a white boy who finishes more than sixteen years of schooling in some technical field before his twenty-fifth birthday will have as close to a certainty of being employed as any statistical statement will allow. Thus the college by a strange set of historical circumstances has become the portal through which a youth must pass if he is to have even a decent chance of finding and holding a job.

But even beyond this, we must recognize that all jobs are not the same. Through certain very deliberate policy decisions taken at various points in our economic system, access to professional training is almost exclusively through an undergraduate college degree program. There are many good things to say about such decisions. Since we are a relatively rich society, it is a good thing to have our doctors and lawyers and undertakers and schoolteachers and football players generally and liberally educated in an undergraduate college before they take up their professional duties. We are willing to pay them more for their services because they have delayed their entry into the market long enough to have picked up the rudiments of general culture.

There are also some very negative things one can say about those decisions which made a college education the sorting station separating those who have access to the protected

professional positions, with all their perquisites, from those who have not. Let us take a concrete example. Right now there is a crying need for computer programmers in just about every technical establishment in this country. A reasonably bright eighteen year old boy or girl who has had a good high school program of mathematics can learn to do certain aspects of programming in about six weeks; such a person can learn enough to do almost any sort of routine programming with about six months intensive training. It is interesting work, the pay is good, the hours are reasonable, the people with whom one associates are generally cultured and civilized individuals.

Why, then, does this work not fill up very quickly with our brightest and most productive young people? Why indeed? If a bright girl who had done very well in her high school mathematics and consulted with one of you about the choice between a couple of years working as a programmer as an alternative to those same years spent in college, you would be very foolhardy to counsel her to accept the job as a programmer. You might think and I might think that a couple of years in an occupation of that sort would do her a great deal of good and might be of more significant advantage to our nation than those same years spent on a college campus. But to advise her to do this in preference to taking a place at a good college would, under the present set of circumstances, be a rather difficult thing to do. There is no guarantee that she would still be eligible for college after that time. She might have to re-take a set of entrance examinations in a variety of subject matters that she would have been out of touch with for rather a long time. She might get married and/or pregnant and thus further reduce her chances of a successful college career. And if she does not have a college background, most of the more responsible jobs, even in her line of work, would be closed to her. I think it is a shame, and so do you, most likely, but I would be forced to advise her for her long range welfare to go to college.

The net economic effect, of course, is that for most the newer occupations, those relatively small areas of the total job market in which there are many more positions than there are qualified applicants, our efforts toward expansion have more effect in raising salaries than in raising production. For it takes a rather long time for more people to get into them.

College, a traditional four year institution inherited from eras altogether different from ours in economic needs, and problems, tends increasingly to stand between the man and the job. This is a hard way to put it, but, I think, not unfair. I do not imply that even for purely economic or technological purposes the time is wasted. It takes less time to train a graduate engineer to do engineering than it would a high school graduate. But when men with engineering

degrees make engineering degrees prerequisite to the training programs of large industrial enterprises, the net effect is to raise the salaries of those already in. It makes the college a very sought after institution; it also forces the undergraduate college to be party to a scheme of job-restriction that makes the union shop seem a model of open-handedness. (Laughter)

I spoke of the field of engineering because I am not in it. I could have taken college teaching, a sector of the economy into which we have poured billions of dollars since World War II. Here again those who held the keys made an academic degree prerequisite to entering the field, this time the even more traditionally guarded Ph.D. And sure enough, it has paid off. University salaries have risen spectacularly during this period; as a consequence, we have given and received hostages from the outside world such that our freedom of action is forever circumscribed.

Many of the evils of the Paper Economy, as described by David T. Bazelon, may be traced to the fact that college trained people not only have to justify their favored position, they also have to make sure that any potential competitor for those positions has college training, preferably an advance degree. But what can college trained people do better than ordinary mortals? They can push paper. In fact, I find it rather odd that with his wide-ranging swath, Bazelon missed this highly significant connection between college and the dominance of paper in our society. (Laughter) But an English academician saw the matter quite clearly:

It has become impossible to receive an intellectual training anywhere in England without being socially corrupted at the same time. I doubt whether the evil can now be undone. It certainly cannot be undone while university policy is directed by ... university Top People, and while Labour spokesmen on education remain devoted to the venerable universities at which they were educated. Any socialist who goes into university education must face the fact that he will lead a life compounded of intellectual integrity and social treachery. I suppose it is worth it.

(This is taken from the academic swan-song of the distinguished historian, Mr. A.J.P. Taylor, published in the New Statesman of May 31, 1963.)

In America we do not have any socialists to amount to anything. We do not have enough of class structure to be able to speak meaningfully of taking the "best sons of the people" away from their class and giving them minor orders in the Establishment. But in a way, our corruption is much deeper simply because our college population is so much larger than the British: we make students and faculty and administration alike beneficiaries in a vast scheme to

reserve what is coming to be the scarcest good in this society, viz. a reasonably stable vocational career, to those who hold an academic diploma.

What has all this to do with Mr. Goodman? Let us recapitulate a moment. We agreed with Mr. Goodman's first point, that there is something not quite human in our treatment of the best-of young people, i.e. those who go to college. Neither in our most prestigious private universities nor in our simple little state teachers colleges do we find that strength, grace, power, and loving abandon that we should expect from the fine young animals we have to work with.

Now why? Goodman has his own ways of putting it; I prefer to say that we have failed to provide our youth with a clear way of distinguishing moral reality from illusion; more seriously even than that, perhaps, we have failed to tell them truthfully that we, their Fathers, cannot make the distinction for ourselves. Goodman would not disagree with this way of putting it. His challenge to us is, from this perspective, well taken.

But Goodman is then required by his own logic to present us with a structural solution. When he faces that crucial point, he advocates a return to the ideal of a small community of scholars and students pursuing the simple and delightful business of transmitting knowledge. Now this is, I believe, absolute nonsense. What I have tried to show is that in relation to the basic facts of social and economic life in this country we are morally compromised beyond hope. Goodman says: the principles of

college reform are clear-cut; to get back to teaching-and-learning as a simple relation of persons, and to make the teaching-and-learning more committed, more for keeps. Is reform of this kind significantly possible within the framework of our colleges and universities? I think so ...

Goodman is simply wrong. Because he is an anarchist and doesn't like the idea of a social system, he commits the fallacy of denying that there is a system. The college in this country is not a matter of simple teaching-and-learning. It is, among other things, a device for assigning the good things of life to one group and crumbs to the rest. Throughout the post World War II period we have been able to provide fairly nourishing crumbs for most of the population, and so the injustice of the system has not, fortunately, been compounded by overt suffering among the majority of our own population. But the underproduction, the anti-social allocation of scarce resources, and above all, the terrifying underutilization of our human resources -- these are sins on the social conscience, and the college, as an institution, owns a heavy share. If we are honest and lucky, we can say as

Taylor did: "I got a very good price for selling out, and that is some consolation."

When Goodman advocates the ideal of poverty to his Community of Scholars, he recognizes that the tie between the social and economic system on one hand and the college on the other must be broken before simple teaching-and-learning can occur. What he fails to see is that the college teacher, implicated in this system, is like any other Father to youth: unwilling or unable to distinguish moral reality from illusion. So we make a doctrine of our despair, we called it relativism. We teach youngsters to say, "Oh, that's a value judgment," as if the expression of one were a faux pas. We act confidently, as if we knew how to justify our new power and wealth, but we can give them only pale reflections from outworn slogans to justify their own pursuit of power and wealth.

Goodman's radical solution doesn't go anywhere near the root of this problem.

(c) Now I will turn to the final section. You, my audience, object. You say, "Surely you haven't proved your case. It is one thing to hold that the college considered now as a distinctive institution in American life, serves to make discriminations among persons, which discriminations have quite important effects in other institutions. That thesis is scarcely subject to question. But you, McClellan, seem to be claiming much more than this, namely that the purposes, the ideals toward which the college ought to be directed, are themselves fully determined by this social function. If Goodman seemed to get the normative and descriptive aspects of his arguments confused, you are doing the same thing even more viciously. At least Goodman was willing to recognize that we may set ourselves higher standards than we are able to fulfill, whereas you seem to reduce everything we do to its often unintended economic consequences. This is grossly unfair." End of stated objections by you. (Laughter)

You have a good point. To everyone save a few neo-orthodox Protestant theologians, there is a difference between the sin of possessing irresponsible power and the sin of exercising it irresponsibly. The colleges now have irresponsible power, in the sense that the power of the keys of the kingdom to economic security and affluence we possess is not explicitly given nor controlled through democratic processes. We inherited it along with the intellectual tradition we perpetuate.

By and large we exercise this power with a considerable degree of justice, more justice, in fact, than we are forced to exercise by any outside power. For example, it is undoubtedly easier for a Negro boy or girl outside the South to get a college place and scholarship than it is for white youngsters of the same intellectual qualifications.

But, of course, it is often far more difficult for the Negro youth to attain these intellectual qualifications in secondary school, so we are only acting to equalize what started out as unequal. I suspect that working man's child at least in some situations, has a finger alongside him in the scale when he is being weighed against another candidate for a scarce position or financial aid. I recognize also that despite our ingrained contempt for purely technical or vocational studies, we have managed to expand this side of our program in response to the direct needs for such training in the economy. But to say that by and large we have exercised our inherited powers quite responsibly is not a conclusive argument that we have a right to them.

This directs us to the third and final element in our treatment of Paul Goodman's philosophy of higher education. American society is doing rather less than we would like for our youth, and we may not be surprised to find our youth doing rather less well by our civilization in the next generation. That seems fair enough. The idea of returning the colleges to the scholars and teachers in order to have a happy little community of professors, students, and veterans without any interfering deans and presidents and boards of trustees we agreed was a charming idea but intellectually irresponsible nonsense when proposed as a solution to the serious problem of academic life. The college is inextricably involved in the economic power structure of the nation and of the world, and it is in this public, corporate work, not in the withdrawal from it, that our justification, if we have any, is to be found.

But what is our place in this power structure? How may we justify our existence? Goodman, on this matter, is not nearly so explicit as we might wish him to be. Here is his most direct comment on the matter:

In...popular sentiment and...history, there is implied a peculiar constitutional relation between the community of scholars and society. Let us try to formulate it. Like the Church, the scholars are special and (ideally) free in society, for they are concerned with matters prior to society and beyond society. Education, concerned with socialization itself, cannot be socialized; and the future of mankind cannot be socialized. But unlike the Church, the scholars do not (ideally) have dogma or mortmain on property and they do not wield a coercive power. As Kant said, they have an "agreement" with the citizens: to free the mind. Also the scholars are this-worldly, not magicians: their rite is the Commencement into society, and the intellectual virtues are active in society.

We can well accept both the letter and the spirit of this definition of a community of scholars. But by it the American college is not and never has been a community

of scholars. It is, as we remarked in the last section, an interdependent sub-system within the larger framework of American life. It draws its sustenance from that larger system and performs certain functions necessary to the ongoing of the system. This structural fact, I take it, is the real reality. This is the metaphysical touchstone. The power that goes with holding a key position in the social structure is real power, however it may be acquired or justified. Thus when Goodman repeats his leit-motif that the college is not serious, is not "for real," we find it rather odd. For the boy who wants to be a lawyer, nothing could be more real than the need to get in and out of college successfully. The same is true for the boy who does not want to be a lawyer but merely to have the things -- access to people, leisure, and beauty -- that goes with being a reasonably successful lawyer. This sorting station is real.

What is not real, and despite everything cannot be real, is the attempt to combine leisure, the "scholē" of Hellenic ideal, with the economic function of higher education. For the undergraduate must sense that both he and we are fraudulent. We cannot give him a genuinely humanistic education; he cannot seek it. We are enmeshed in an institution devoted to the main chance.

Here we reach an unbridgeable chasm between Goodman's thought and mine. Goodman says: There is no system of facts, only systems of thought." ("Freedom To Be Academic" in Identity and Anxiety, p. 362.) Goodman says: "That Americans can allow this kind of thing instead of demolishing it with a blow of the paw like a strong lion, is the psychology of missed revolutions."

No, Mr. Goodman, the social system is a fact, not a thought. No, Mr. Goodman, revolutions are not missed because of psychology but because power was not concentrated and devoted to a specific task.

Our basic guilt is not one of a personal lack of seriousness and purpose, but rather a structural phenomenon of the social reality that makes us, willy-nilly, arbiters of other people's destiny. We cannot sweep it all away like a strong young lion. At best we can correct the inequities slowly and piecemeal, like a wily old fox. Such power as we can concentrate to effect a revolution in higher education, we can exercise only from within the system, not in withdrawal from it. Any use of power, of course, makes us sinful, we grant. It causes tears of remorse and regret. There is no education without tears. If we are hypocrites we stand before our students as bearers of moral wisdom; if we are sincere, we stand as ever frustrated seekers of moral wisdom.

But what is the alternative? There was an age, we are told, when withdrawal could create a moral example to illumine the larger society. There was also an age of miracles. Both are past. Withdrawal today puts one in the

position described so beautifully by a character in one of Goodman's short stories: "I thought of us ghouls in the University...who passed on our culture, just for the immortality of it. Like a clench of the fist... My animal spirit has left me; I am without lust; I could be pushed this way or that or just left to lie..." (Prolonged applause)

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: Dr. McClellan, our gratitude and thanks. The audience has expressed its appreciation by applause. It is one speech which I certainly will be delighted to see in the proceedings. There are so many brilliant passages which I wish to share with my faculty colleagues, and I am sure many of you felt the same way.

I would make only one comment, Jim. You are not in the city of Chicago. You are in the Athens of the middle west, celebrating its centennial. (Laughter)

At this time Mr. O. D. Roberts wants to make some announcements, I think, and we want him to make them.

CONFERENCE CHAIRMAN ROBERTS: Just a word or two. I suspect the Conference Chairman has to always have a last series of announcements, but I do want to get a few things read into the record.

I would like to pay tribute to the fine staff here at Northwestern which has helped us so graciously in putting on this Conference. I would name specifically Mrs. James McLeod and Miss Patricia Thrash, the people here in Jim's office staff, his secretary Mrs. Robertson, his own personal staff, Joe Miller, Mrs. Thrash, Henry McAdams, Mr. Willard Buntin, Mr. Cappillo, and I think we have never recognized the gentleman who helped us so wonderfully in the halls by providing excellent food, Mr. Bruno Adams, and also Mrs. Frances Yearley. Special thanks, of course, to Mrs. Virginia Drake and Bob Crane of the University of Illinois, who helped.

I would like to remind you of the dates of the next Conference. For 1964, April 5-8, at the Park Shelton Hotel, Detroit. The 1965 Conference is April 4-7 at the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington, D. C. Please assist me by returning your critique forms as rapidly as possible. I would appreciate letters from any of you relative to the Conference, suggestions for formats, suggestions for speakers. As I indicated, you are the program committee.

Jim, let me thank you directly for your wonderful help in providing wonderful host facilities here at Northwestern. You were most gracious to work with, and I know all of us have appreciated being here very much. (Applause)

See you in Detroit.

CHAIRMAN McLEOD: Thank you very much, O. D. Believe me, this never would have happened without his help

and the frequent trips that were necessary from Lafayette to Evanston, and the telephone calls back and forth. Since we were both neophytes in getting ready for this Conference, we admit having dropped the ball a few times but we are here and I think in reflection we will consider it certainly a worthwhile experience.

Are there any matters that anyone wishes to bring before the meeting at this time?

I would like to make one inquiry: Is Jack Clevenger here? No. All these beautiful tributes I want to pay to him, and he is not in the room. Well, for the record, and off the cuff: I am sure all of us are well aware of the fact that no more dedicated person has ever served as President of NASPA; not only by communication but by personal effort and attendance at a great many meetings which were allied to and related to NASPA, Jack Clevenger has demonstrated an amazing ability to carry on a principal job as a dean of students at his university and give leadership to NASPA. His various ad hoc committees, the meetings of the executive committee have all been of great assistance in instrumenting and bringing into being some very vital aspects of our Association which might never have been realized and fulfilled without this kind of leadership. Of course, I shall continue to lean heavily upon him during the next year as he serves on the executive committee as immediate past president.

I am not going to make any speech. Last night I might have said something if Jack had not thrown me for a loop by getting just a little sentimental, and I cannot quite take that. Being Scotch, I am going to get the same way, so I choke up and cannot say it.

Gentlemen, if you will rise, perhaps the most fitting way that we can conclude this Conference is the way we began it. I would share with you and with God a brief prayer.

God of our fathers, and our God, as we come to the parting we give Thee thanks for these days together; for the real work accomplished, the shared dreams, the thought-through plans, the challenges accepted, we thank Thee. We are grateful for the quickening of old friendships, the new and fruitful contacts, for the constant loyalty of the devoted members. We pray that we may all have a fresh devotion to the aims and the ideals of our Association, and have courage in the face of discouragement, and renewed dedication to share in the common task of helping to create the richest and noblest climate for young men and women of our colleges and universities, of which we are capable.

Now as we turn our faces homeward, knowing that new tasks and challenges, burdens, heartaches and disillusionment may well be our lot, we sense our utter need for Thee who art the great companion of our souls. Wilt

Thou be the strength of our weakness, the wisdom of our foolishness, the triumph of our failures, and the changeless unit of our changing days.

Knowing the brevity of our years, help us work resolutely with faith in Thee, our fellow men, and ourselves. We ask it in the name of one who came that we might have life more abundantly. Amen.

... The Conference adjourned at eleven-twenty o'clock ...

APPENDIX A

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY April 1, 1962 - June 15, 1963

In the proper sense of the word, the fourteen and one-half months between the 44th Annual Conference and the 45th have been "vivid." NASPA has prospered in many ways including increased membership, widespread participation, added publications and tangible accomplishments.

ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP

10 years ago (1953)	Total Members	229
5 years ago (1958)	Total Members	294
1 year ago (1962)	Total Members	366

Members added since April 1, 1962 31

Members dropped since April 1, 1962 1

CURRENT TOTAL MEMBERSHIP JUNE 1, 1963 396
(Membership inquiries pending 31)

MEMBERS ADDED SINCE THE PHILADELPHIA MEETING

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Location</u>
Adrian College		Adrian, Michigan
Andrews University	J. W. Cassell, Jr.	Berrien Springs, Michigan
Bridgeport, Univ. of	Alfred R. Wolff	Bridgeport, Conn.
Carroll, John Univ.	James M. Lavin	Cleveland, Ohio
Central State College	Charles H. Richmond	Edmond, Oklahoma
Clarion State College	Darrell F. Rishel	Clarion, Penna.
College of the Holy Cross	Charles J. Dunn, S.J.	Sorcester, Mass.
Defiance College, The	William Reynolds	Defiance, Ohio
Ferris Institute	Donald F. Rankin	Big Rapids, Mich.
Franklin & Marshall Col.	Hadley S. De Puy	Lancaster, Penna.
Gannon College	Rev. Louis Puscas	Erie, Penna.
Kansas City, Univ. of	Wheadon Bloch	Kansas City, Mo.
Malone College	Louis E. Caister	Canton, Ohio
Millikin University	Byron L. Kerns	Decatur, Ill.
Monmouth College	Robert A. Hogg	West Long Beach, New Jersey
Morris Harvey College	Frank J. Krebs	Charleston, W.Va.
Nasson College	Robert D. Witherill	Springvale, Maine
Northern Michigan Col.	Allan L. Niemi	Marquette, Mich.
Northwestern State Col.	Richard B. Caple	Alva, Oklahoma
Northwest Missouri State College	C. E. Koerble	Maryville, Mo.
Univ. of Notre Dame	Rev. Charles McGarragher, CSC	Notre Dame, Ind.
Rice Institute		Houston, Texas
St. Cloud State Col.	Robert G. Tomwinkle	St. Cloud, Minn.

Association for Higher Education
Fraternity Scholarship Association
Inter-Association Coordinating Committee
Interfraternity Research and Advisory Council
National Association of College Unions
National Association of Foreign Student Advisers
National Association of Women Deans and Counselors
National Interfraternity Conference
Numerous National Fraternity Conferences
Phi Eta Sigma - National Conference
United States National Student Association
Various Inaugurations and Celebrations
Western Personnel Conference
YMCA - National Assembly

State and regional student personnel meetings have been reported via the "BREEZE." It is only by chance and the kindness of participants that NASPA knows of these organizations. Would it be wise to work toward a volunteer effort of establishing a current listing of such groups, and maintaining a liaison with local officers?

As NASPA grows and extends her line of service, publications become more and more important. Unique to the field of student personnel, are our Proceedings which provide a continuous coverage of past conferences of NASPA and NADAM. Copies were sent to all conference registrants, all institutional representatives not in attendance, and to our library subscribers including Harvard, Yale, Columbia, University of California at Berkeley, Michigan, Minnesota, Illinois, et al.

A "Directory of Student Personnel and Related Organizations in Colleges and Universities" was edited by H. Don Winbigger, Chairman of Commission I. This second annual edition was well received. Courtesy copies were sent to the Executive Committee members of all organizations listed therein. From reports and requests received at my desk, this is a project well worth repeating on a continuous basis.

The brochure entitled "College Student Personnel Work As A Career" had a 10,000 print out at Wayne State University. Bill Brown of Purdue and Jimmie Allen of Texas Tech deserve kudos for getting this Commission III project off the ground. Don Marsh mailed copies to NASPA members. Copies were sent to all non-NASPA Deans as well. Tom Emmet forwarded copies to I.I.A.C. members as well as to schools with personnel training programs. In answer to requests from High School Guidance Counselors, professional personnel trainers and other sources, the supply ran dry several weeks ago. NASPA is in the front row in pole position on this project and it ought to be continued. Correspondence and postage costs went up with the hundreds of inquiries, but it's a wonderful feeling to be riding a winner.

The NASPA membership brochures must be given some credit for our surge in membership. They are convenient to enclose

with a brief note of transmittal. A tip of the hat to our President-Designate Jim McLeod for this contribution.

Seven issues of the NASPA "Breeze" have been mailed to all member institutions since the last conference. Fifty-two placement profiles from Dean Arno Nowotny, Placement Officer, an extensive legal document by O'Leary and Templin, several book reviews, digests of articles and items judged to be of interest to members of the Association have been circulated.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE HIGHLIGHTS

(Full minutes of three meetings are on file.)

Time at each meeting was devoted to Conference Program.

Bonding and Audit for Treasurer was authorized.

NASPA fiscal year set from July 1 to June 30.

Seven hundred dollars were authorized to Commission VI (Financial Aids) to meet in Washington, D. C. and Chicago to cover partial expenses.

Co-sponsorship of Sex Mores Workshop was declined because of high school involvement plus grant arrangements.

Endorsed Book Exhibit for Conference.

Tom Emmet was voted \$150.00 to attend I.A.C.C. training sessions at A.C.P.A.

Name Changes - Commission VII Religious Activities changed to "Commission on Student Attitudes and Values."

Committee on "International Exchange of Students" changed to "Committee on International Student Programs."

Authorized Don Marsh, Commission III, to set up a Two Day Training Seminar for 75 registrants. Ten dollar registration fee was voted to cover printing plus Room and Board for Leaders and Old Pros.

Special Committees

Three man committee appointed to evaluate present election procedures versus a real double slate. Will report to Executive Committee.

Committee appointed to prepare a statement of function and purpose concerning a Committee on Housing. (Focus on ACUHO not AIA.)

Plans made plus acceptances to switch Placement from "Shorty" Nowotny to "Dick" Hulet (I.S.N.U.) at the Northwestern Conference.

SUBCOMMITTEES OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE SECRETARY (SECRETARIAT) has not reported in final form except to indicate high costs for a central office.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Raise institutional membership to \$50.00 for 1964-65.
Establish Conference Registration 1963-64 \$15.00.
(Make Conference self-sustaining)
(Make Association stand for all expenses)
Develop budget for 1963-64.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS

July 1, 1963, convert "Breeze" into printed 8 page Newsletter, 4 issues per year - cost around \$1,800.00.

Editor to be appointed by Executive Committee.

Establish a Publications Committee with Chairman on Executive Committee to whom Editor reports.

Build up Publications Reserve to \$1,000.00.

Study the Proceedings re curtailing costs.

SUBCOMMITTEE RE NAME AND FUNCTION

Statement of NASPA Functions to be evaluated and considered at Northwestern Conference.

Proposal regarding a name change for NASPA. Requests (1) Present name be retained or (2) American Association of Deans of Students for consideration at Northwestern Conference.

Sponsored NASPA President on Washington visit to A.C.E., Association of Land Grant Colleges and A.P.G.A.

IN CONCLUSION

In my best judgment, this has been a productive year for NASPA. Officers and the Executive Committee have been a real working crew. Diversity of opinion has melded into progress. The strength of volunteer effort in this Association never ceases to impress this observer. The future success of NASPA depends in a large way upon a broad base of participation.

The efforts of Miss Marilyn Smith until December, 1962, and the services of Mrs. Virginia Drake since that time, are appreciated for what they have contributed to the Association. I'm grateful to have been of some service to fellow deans over the country and sorry not to have done more.

Very sincerely yours,

Carl W. Knox, Secretary-Treasurer

P.S. A future Keynote for progress and direction may have been sounded with the late word that the proposal of Commission VIII, on "The Student and Social Issues," chaired by Ed Williamson, has just received a \$53,000.00 grant from the Hazen Foundation.
C.W.K.

INTERIM TREASURER'S REPORT
March 22, 1962, through June 1, 1963

RECEIPTS

Balance on Hand, 3/22/62	\$7,803.98	
1962 Conference Receipts	7,931.26	
Dues Received	9,300.00	
Sale of Proceedings	127.00	
Misc. Receipts	13.00	
Balance on Hand & Total Receipts		\$25,175.24

DISBURSEMENTS

Annual Conference Expense:		
1962 Conference Expense	5,290.36	
Cost of Proceedings	3,256.45	
Conference Chairman	1,200.00	
Badges	47.80	
Supplies for Conference	57.19	
Book Exhibit Brochure	132.00	
Total Conference Expense		9,983.80
Secretary-Treasurer's Expense:		
Printing and Mimeographing	249.97	
Postage	812.64	
Stenographic Service	497.00	
Books and Magazines	5.59	
Secretary's Allotment	100.00	
Typewriter	320.00	
Total Secretary-Treasurer's Expense		1,985.20
Executive Committee Expenses:		
President's Fund	300.00	
Meeting Expenses	1,801.01	
Commission & Committee Exp.	1,242.99	
Total Executive Com. Exp.		3,344.00
Bonding and Auditing		37.50
Brochures:		
Consulting Services	66.95	
Membership Brochure	129.00	
College Student Personnel Work	620.87	
Directory	408.51	
Total Brochures		1,225.33
Miscellaneous Expenses:		
American Council Dues	300.00	
Misc. Expenses	95.50	
Total Miscellaneous Exp.		395.50
Total Disbursements		16,971.33
BALANCE ON HAND JUNE 1, 1963		<u>\$ 8,203.91</u>

APPENDIX B

1 9 6 3

ASSOCIATION OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES

Conference Chairman
Dean O. D. Roberts
Purdue University

Registration Secretary
Mrs. Virginia Drake
University of Illinois

Conference Reporter
Mr. Leo Isen
Chicago, Illinois

Exhibit Chairman
Dean Robert Crane
University of Illinois

THE COMMISSIONS

Commission I
Professional Relations

The functional relationships between NASPA and the numerous agencies distributed through the organization of higher education whose interests touch those of student personnel administration are the concern of this commission. The commission has taken an important part in the development of the Inter-Association Coordinating Committee composed of representatives of NASPA, NAWDC, ACPA, AACRAO, ACHUO, NAFSA, and ACU.

Chairman: H. Donald Winbigler, Dean of Students,
Stanford University
Stanley C. Benz, Dean of Students, San Jose State College
J. Gordon Brown, Dean of Men, Emory and Henry College
J. C. Clevenger, Dean of Students, Washington State Univ.
K. Patricia Cross, Dean of Students, Cornell University
Stanton Curtis, Dean of Men, Boston University
Thomas A. Emmet, Dean of Men, University of Detroit
A. Lincoln Fisch, University of Michigan
Stuart Good, Dean of Student Affairs, Cornell College
Carl M. Grip, Dean of Men, Temple University
Arthur Keindl, Dean of Students, University of Colorado
Lawrence A. Riggs, Dean of Students, DePauw University
David W. Robinson, Dean of Students, Emory University
Mylin H. Ross, Dean of Men, Ohio State University
John H. Stibbs, Dean of Students, Tulane University

Commission II
Professional and Legal Principles and Problems

Two assignments have been given to this commission. One is to review and revise periodically the "Statement of Principles and Professional Ethics" printed in this program. The second

is to study the legal problems which confront student personnel administrators, to review the statutes of the several states which afford protection to the counselor and student personnel administrator, and to advise on institutional policies which guide officers in the discharge of their legal duties.

Chairman: John P. Gwin, Dean of Students, Beloit College
Francis C. Bourbon, S.J., Dean of Men, Loyola College
Charles Gambs, Associate Dean, Ohio State University
John E. Hocutt, Dean of Students, University of Delaware
Jack Matthews, Dean of Students, University of Missouri
Weldon P. Shofstall, Dean of Students, Arizona State Univ.
Louis Toepfer, Vice Dean of Admissions, Harvard University
Law School

Commission III Development and Training of Student Personnel Administrators

The recruitment, development, and training of student personnel administrators is the over-all concern of this commission. Current projects include the preparation of publishable materials and cooperation with other associations in the designing of study and training programs.

Chairman: Robert H. Shaffer, Dean of Students,
Indiana University
James G. Allen, Dean of Student Life, Texas Technological
College
C. Wm. Brown, Assistant Dean of Men, Purdue University
Alexander Cameron, Assistant Dean of Students, University
of Rochester
Kenneth Collier, Assistant Dean of Students, Ball State
Teachers College
Robert Crane, Associate Dean of Men, Univ. of Illinois
Burns Crookston, Associate Dean of Students, Univ. of Utah
William Denman, Dean of Students, Elmhurst College
Thomas A. Emmet, Dean of Men, University of Detroit
Robert F. Etheridge, Dean of Students, Miami University
Donald A. Kluge, Dean of Men, Eastern Illinois University
J. Donald Marsh, Assistant Dean of Students, Wayne State U.
C. Milton Pike, Jr., Dean of Students, Central Michigan Col.
Louis C. Stamatakis, Dean of Men, University of Wisconsin
in Milwaukee
John Truitt, Dean of Students, Indiana State Teachers Col.
Ken R. Vanderbush, Dean of Men, Lawrence College

Commission IV Programs and Practices Evaluation

This commission serves as a clearing house for information and literature dealing with evaluation of student personnel work. Its interests include the study of existing evaluative

devices and encouraging research on such devices in areas of student personnel work where they are most needed.

Chairman: Henry L. McCloskey, Dean of Students, Loyola University
Shelton B. Beatty, Dean of Men, Pomona College
James E. Carr, Jr., Director of Financial Aids, Florida State University
Clifford J. Craven, Dean of Students, Univ. of Oklahoma
Marion L. Huit, Dean of Students, State Univ. of Iowa
J. Towner Smith, Dean of Men, Western Michigan University
Philip A. Tripp, Dean of Students, Washburn University

Commission V Relationships with the Behavioral Sciences

The strengthening of relationships between student personnel administration and research and teaching activities in the behavioral sciences is the purpose of this commission. It is concerned both with relationships between professional persons in terms of attitudes and perceptions and with relationships between the work of the student personnel administrator and the knowledge and contributions of the behavioral scientists.

Chairman: John W. Alexander, Dean, Columbia College
Peter Armacost, Dean of Students, Augsburg College
Earle W. Clifford, Dean of Men, Syracuse University
James W. Dean, Dean of Student Affairs, Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Arthur E. Gordon, Director of Student Personnel, Georgetown University
Lester L. Hale, Dean of Student Affairs, University of Florida
David L. Harris, Dean of Men, Ripon College
S. Joseph House, Dean of Students, Newark College of Engineering
Glen T. Nygreen, Dean of Students, Kent State University
Lawrence A. Riggs, Dean of Students, DePauw University
Gary R. Schwartz, Dean of Student Personnel Services, Western Illinois University
Richard Siggelkow, Dean of Students, University of Buffalo
Lawrence C. Smith, Dean of Students, Texas Christian Univ.
Mark W. Smith, Dean of Men, Denison University
William E. Toombs, Dean of Men, Drexel Institute of Technology

Commission VI Student Financial Aids

Its purpose is to analyze national trends in the providing of financial assistance to college students. It is to formulate an expression of the Association's views after a review of

studies and a gathering of opinion from member institutions.

Chairman: Carl M. Grip, Dean of Men, Temple University
Sam M. Basta, Dean of Students, University of Nevada
Paul A. Bloland, Dean of Students, Drake University
Thomas L. Broadbent, Dean of Students, Univ. of California
I. Clark Davis, Dean of Students, Southern Illinois Univ.
Arno J. Haack, Dean of Students, Washington University
Noble B. Hendrix, Dean of Students, University of Miami
William H. Knapp, Assistant Director, Wayne State Univ.
O. William Lacy, Dean of Students, Trinity College
Leroy E. Luberg, Vice President, University of Wisconsin
George L. Playe, Dean of Undergraduate Students,
University of Chicago
John Summerskill, Vice President, Cornell University
George Watson, Dean of Students, Roosevelt University

Commission VII Student Attitudes and Values

This commission is concerned with the moral, ethical, and spiritual values in the student community which are essentially pluralistic. It also studies the developing relationships among the various student religious organizations for the purpose of identifying and understanding the reporting to the association on this particular and limited area of student life and student activities.

Chairman: Joseph C. Gluck, Director of Student Affairs,
West Virginia University
Dewitt C. Baldwin, Coordinator of Religious Affairs,
University of Michigan
John L. Blackburn, Dean of Men, University of Alabama
Floyd Bowling, Dean of Students, Tennessee Wesleyan College
Allen C. Brooks, Dean of Men, The Principia College
Stuart Good, Dean of Student Affairs, Cornell College
Alfred J. Kilp, S.J., Dean of Men, Loyola University
Philip Price, Director of Student Activities, New York U.
Lyle Reynolds, Dean of Students, Univ. of California
Leonard P. Sardo, Dean of Students, College of Steubenville
Victor Trusler, Dean of Men, Kansas State Teachers College

Commission VIII The Student and Social Issues

A commission to study and appraise the responsibilities of student personnel administrators in connection with student discussion and action upon social issues.

Chairman: E. G. Williamson, Dean of Students, University
of Minnesota
Donald K. Anderson, Dean of Students, Univ. of Washington

Armour J. Blackburn, Dean of Students, Howard University
James H. Kreuzer, Associate Dean of Students, Queens Coll.
O. W. Lacy, Dean of Students, Trinity College
Patrick H. Ratterman, S.J., Dean of Men, Xavier University
Walter B. Rea, Dean of Students, University of Michigan
David W. Robinson, Dean of Students, Emory University
W. L. Swartzbaugh, Dean of Students, Amherst College

COMMITTEE ON
NOMINATIONS AND PLACE

(Made up of all Past Presidents in attendance, plus three members elected by the Association. The senior Past President present serves as the Chairman.)

Dean Scott H. Goodnight, University of Wisconsin, 1919 (1),
1928 (10)
Dean W. E. Alderman, Miami University, 1936 (18)
President D. S. Lancaster, Longwood College, 1937 (19)
Vice President D. H. Gardner, University of Akron, 1938 (20),
1939 (21)
Vice President J. J. Thompson, St. Olaf College, 1951 (23)
Vice President J. H. Julian, University of South Dakota,
1944 (26)
Dean Arno Nowotny, University of Texas, 1947 (29)
Dean E. C. Cloyd, North Carolina State College, 1948 (30)
Dean J. H. Newman, University of Alabama, 1949 (31)
Dean L. K. Neidlinger, Dartmouth College, 1950 (32)
Dean Wesley P. Lloyd, Brigham Young University, 1951 (33)
President A. Blair Knapp, Denison University, 1952 (34)
President Victor F. Spathelf, Ferris Institute, 1953 (35)
Dean John H. Stibbs, Tulane University, 1955 (37)
Dean John E. Hocutt, University of Delaware, 1956 (38)
Secretary Frank C. Baldwin, Cornell University, 1957 (39)
Dean Donald M. DuShane, University of Oregon, 1958 (40)
Dean Fred H. Turner, University of Illinois, 1959 (41)
Dean H. Donald Winbigler, Stanford University, 1960 (42)
William S. Guthrie, formerly Ohio State University, 1961 (43)
Secretary Fred J. Weaver, University of North Carolina,
1962 (44)

Elected Members:

Theodore Zillman, Dean of Men, University of Wisconsin
Mylin Ross, Dean of Men, Ohio State University
Robert H. Shaffer, Dean of Students, Indiana University

Alternates:

Robert F. Etheridge, Dean of Students, Miami University
Glen T. Nygreen, Dean of Students, Kent State University
James E. Foy, Dean of Student Affairs, Auburn University

THE CONTINUING COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON CONSULTING SERVICES

This committee is to inventory the consulting resources on student personnel problems available from members of the Association. It will also recommend procedures by which these services may be made available to member institutions and others interested.

Chairman: Fred H. Turner, Dean of Students, University of Illinois

Clifford J. Craven, Dean of Students, University of Oklahoma

John E. Hocutt, Dean of Students, University of Delaware

Richard E. Hulet, Dean of Men, Illinois State Normal Univ.

Carlton L. Krathwohl, Research Associate, Syracuse Univ.

Juan Reid, Dean of Men, Colorado College

John H. Stibbs, Dean of Students, Tulane University

H. Donald Winbigler, Dean of Students, Stanford University

Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J., Vice President of Student

Personnel, Fordham University

Ralph A. Young, Dean of Men, College of Wooster

COMMITTEE ON COOPERATION WITH NATIONAL STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

A standing committee with the function of maintaining the Association's relationships with all national student organizations. It advises on problems and opportunities involving these organizations with NASPA and its member institutions.

Chairman: John Gillis, Assistant Dean of Men, Illinois State Normal University

William E. Toombs, Dean of Men, Drexel Institute of Technology

Sam M. Basta, Dean of Student Affairs, University of Nevada

Alan Coutts, Dean of Men, Dickinson College

Raymond C. King, Head Resident, Columbia University

Ross R. Oglesby, Dean of Students, Florida State University

Hilton Rivet, S.J., Dean of Students, Spring Hill College

Rod E. Shearer, Director of Resident Students, University of Detroit

COMMITTEE ON FRATERNITY RELATIONS

A standing committee to develop programs, to provide information to NASPA and to maintain relations with others concerning fraternity matters. It offers judgment on moral correctness, educational soundness, and political feasibility of programs in order to aid NASPA to fulfill its responsibilities to its member institutions and to higher education.

Chairman: Ben E. David, Dean of Men, University of Miami

Roland D. Patzer, Dean of Men, University of Vermont
 Roger Anderson, Dean of Men, Arizona State University
 Donald M. DuShane, Dean of Students, University of Oregon
 David L. Harris, Dean of Men, Ripon College
 Donald R. Mallett, Vice President and Executive Dean,
 Purdue University
 William R. Nester, Dean of Men, University of Cincinnati
 O. Edward Pollock, Dean of Students, Union College and
 University
 Ron Roskens, Dean of Men, Kent State University
 Ronald S. Stead, Dean of Men, Ohio Wesleyan University

COMMITTEE ON COOPERATION WITH FOREIGN STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

A committee to prepare recommendations for a NASPA policy statement concerning the aims and operations of foreign student programs on the American campus, and of study programs abroad for American students, with special reference to the responsibilities of student personnel administration in these areas. This committee considers new and proposed government programs and recommends positions and action to NASPA.

Chairman: Donald K. Anderson, Dean of Students, University of Washington
 Donald K. Alderson, Dean of Men, University of Kansas
 John L. Blackburn, Dean of Men, University of Alabama
 Mark H. Almlı, Dean of Men, St. Olaf College
 Leo Dowling, Associate Dean of Students, University of Indiana
 James B. Macrae, Dean of Students, Lincoln University
 F. David Mathews, Assistant Dean of Men, University of Alabama

COMMITTEE ON MEMBERSHIP

A committee to make recommendations to the Association on membership policy and to conduct a selective campaign of membership solicitation among eligible institutions.

Chairman: James G. Allen, Dean of Student Life, Texas Technological College
 Mark Barlow, Dean of Men, Middletown College
 Shelton L. Beatty, Dean of Men, Pomona College
 Walter Blake, Dean of Students, Willamette University
 Jean C. Bouffard, Dean of Students, Laval University
 Phillip R. Campbell, Assistant Dean of Men, University of Miami
 William D. Lippincott, Dean of Students, Princeton Univ.
 Juan J. Reid, Dean of Men, Colorado College
 Frank J. Simes, Dean of Men, Penn State University
 Jorgen G. Thompson, Dean of Men, Augustana College

COMMITTEE ON PLACEMENT

A committee to assist the Placement Officer in providing an effective placement service for members of the Association for other qualified persons seeking positions in the student personnel field. Committee members assist the Placement Officer at the annual Conference and, during the year, act as regional representatives of the Association in placement activities.

Chairman: Arno Nowotny, Dean of Student Life, University of Texas
Richard E. Hulet, Dean of Men, Illinois State Normal Univ.
Ben E. David, Dean of Men, University of Miami
Robert C. Goodridge, Dean of Students, University of Redlands
Paul L. Griffeth, Dean of Students, Western Michigan Univ.
John Quinn, Dean of Men, Rhode Island University
Laurence C. Smith, Dean of Students, Texas Christian Univ.
James J. Stewart, Jr., Dean of Student Affairs, North Carolina State College

INTER-ASSOCIATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE 1962 - 63

Chairman, J. C. Clevenger

An organization consisting presently of seven national associations in the student personnel field with the primary purpose being that of coordinating common interests. Participating associations are:

1. American College Personnel Association
2. American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers
3. Association of College Unions
4. Association of College and University Housing Officers
5. National Association of Women Deans and Counselors
6. National Association of Foreign Student Advisers
7. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators

NASPA Representatives are:

J. C. Clevenger, NASPA President and Dean of Students, Washington State University
Carl M. Grip, NASPA Chairman of Commission V and Dean of Men, Temple University
James McLeod, NASPA President-Designate and Dean of Students, Northwestern University
H. Donald Winbigger, NASPA Chairman of Commission I and Dean of Students, Stanford University

NASPA Representatives to IACC Subcommittees are:

- Subcommittee on Student Financial Aids -- Dean Carl Grip,
Temple University
- Subcommittee on Professional Preparation and Education
of Student Personnel Workers -- Dean Thomas A. Emmet,
University of Detroit
- Subcommittee on Relationships with National Accrediting
Agencies with Reference to Student Services --
Dean H. Donald Winbigler, Stanford University
- Subcommittee on Relationships with Research Centers for
Higher Education -- Dean Dirck W. Brown,
Denver University

NASPA ANNUAL CONFERENCE DATES

- 1964 -- April 5-8, The Park Shelton, Detroit, Michigan
Host Dean - Harold E. Stewart, Wayne State University
- 1965 -- April 4-7, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D. C.
Host Dean - Armour J. Blackburn, Howard University
- 1966 -- Late June, Seattle, Washington
Host Dean - Donald K. Anderson, Univ. of Washington

APPENDIX C

ATTENDANCE FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
Adams, Donald V.	Asst. Dean of Students	Michigan State Univ.
Adams, Frank T., Jr.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Florida
Alexander, John W.	Assoc. Dean	Columbia College
*Allen, James	Dean of Students	Texas Technology Col.
Anderson, Carl	Dir. of Student Activities	Howard University
Anderson, Donald K.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Washington
Anfinson, Rudolph D.	Dean, Student Personnel Services	Eastern Illinois Univ.
Atwood, Edward C., Jr.	Dean of Students	Washington & Lee Univ.
*Babkowski, Walter J.	Graduate Student	Lehigh University
Bacon, Franklin	Dean of Students	Medical Coll. of Va.
Baisi, Neal	Dean of Students	W.Va. Institute of Tech.
Baker, H. L.	Financial Aid Counselor	Anderson College
Ball, E. H.	Dean of Men	Monmouth College
Banaghan, William	Coordinator of Student Affairs	Southern Illinois University
Barrett, George B., Rev.	Vice President	Univ. of Dayton
Barnes, Ronald E.	Associate Director of Student Affairs	Iowa State University
*Basta, Sam M.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Nevada
Bates, John E.	Counselor of Men's Activities	Wayne State University
Beatty, Shelton L.	Dean of Men	Pomona College
*Bennett, B. W.	Vice President	National Interfraternity Conference
*Bennion, Lowell L.	Asst. Dean of Students	University of Utah
Benz, Stanley C.	Dean of Students	San Jose State College
Berry, R. C.	Adviser of Men	The University of Men
Better, N. M.	Assoc. Dean of Students	Univ. of Calif.-Riverside
Beyerl, Jack	Dean of Students	Ball State College
Blackburn, Armour J.	Dean of Students	Howard University
Blackburn, John L.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Alabama
Blake, Walter S., Jr.	Dean of Students	Willamette University
Block, Walter F.	Administrative Assistant	Loyola University-Chicago
Bloch, Wheadon	Dean of Students	Univ. of Kansas City
Bloland, Paul A.	Dean of Students	Drake University
Bonner, John T., Jr.	Executive Dean	Ohio State University
Borreson, B. J.	Executive Dean for Student Life	Univ. of Maryland
Bouffard, Jean-Charles	Dean of Students	Laval University
Bowling, Floyd	Dean of Students	Tenn. Wesleyan Coll.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
Brewer, Warren, Jr.	Dean of Men	Washington College
Briggs, Channing M.	Dean of Students	Portland State Coll.
Broadbent, Thomas L.	Dean of Students	Univ. of California
Brooks, Allen C.	Dean of Men	Principia College
Brosseit, Stuart	Asst. to the Dean of Men	Univ. of Cincinnati
Brown, C. William	Asst. Dean of Men	Purdue University
Brown, George K.	Dean, Division of Student Affairs	Carnegie Institute of Technology
Brown, J. Gordon	Dean of Men	Emory & Henry College
Brown, Paul L.	Dean of Men	State Univ. College
Brown, Warren O.	Assoc. Dean of Students	Univ. of Illinois- Chicago
Brugger, A. T.	Dean of Men	Univ. of California- Los Angeles
Bumgardner, Douglas C.	Dean of Men	Morris Harvey College
*Burger, William V.	Dean of Students	Colo. School of Mines
Burtenshar, Claude J.	Dean of Student Services	Utah State Univ.
Butler, Robert E., Rev.	Dean of Men	LeMoyne College
Campbell, Phillip R.	Dean of Students	Florida Southern Col.
Cheney, R. William	Dean of Students	Springfield College
Churchill, J. L.	Dean of Students	Oregon Tech.
Clark, Arthur B.	Graduate Student	Pacific School of Religion
Clark, Roy C.	Executive Secy.	Acacia
*Clevenger, J. C.	Dean of Students	Washington State Univ.
Clifford, Earle W.	Dean of Men	Syracuse University
Connole, Paul H.	Asst. Dean of Students	Washington University
Cornelius, Fran	Asst. Dean of Students	State University College
Corson, Louis D.	Consultant	Assoc. of American Col.
Courter, John F.	Dean of Students	Kansas Wesleyan Univ.
Crane, Robert	Assoc. Dean of Men	Univ. of Illinois
Craven, Clifford J.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Oklahoma
Crosby, Howard J.	Assoc. Dean of Men	Rutgers University
Cunningham, Richard A.	Dean of Students	W.Va. Wesleyan College
Davies, James	Asst. to Dean of Students	Tulane University
Dean, James W.	Dean of Students	Virginia Polytechnic Institute
DeBruhl, Bruce D.		Syracuse University
Decker, Charles O.	Dean of Students	University of Idaho
DeMarr, Frederick S.	Dean of Students	C. W. Post College
Denman, W. F.	Dean of Students	Elmhurst College
Denning, R. A.	Dean of Freshmen	Rensselaer Poly- technic Institute
Dennis, Lawrence	Director	American Council on Education
DePuy, H. S.	Dean of Students	Franklin & Marshall

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
De Sena, Paul	Counselor Coord.	Penn. State University
*Donahue, Timothy S.	Dir. of Resident Personnel	Clarkson College of Technology
Donoghue, Joseph	Assoc. Director of Res. Students	Univ. of Detroit
Doremus, James C.	Asst. Dean of Students	Franklin & Marshall College
*Dull, James E.	Assoc. Dean of Students	Georgia Institute of Technology
*DuShane, Donald M.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Oregon
Dutton, Thomas B.	Dean of Men	Ohio University
Dux, Henry A.	Asst. Dean of Men	Univ. of Rhode Island
Eastment, George T.	Dean of Men	Manhattan College
Eaton, Paul C.	Dean of Students	Calif. Inst. of Tech.
Eddy, Raymond O.	Dir. of Student Activities & Adviser to Men	Upsala College
Edwards, Thomas	Dean of Students	Kenyon College
Eichhorn, O. J.	Asst. to Dean of Students	Univ. of Denver
Elsey, Robert W.	Asst. to the Dean of Men	Purdue University
Emmet, Thomas A.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Detroit
Etheridge, Robert	Dean of Students	Miami University
Ewalt, Robert	Asst. Dean of Men	Univ. of Illinois
Eycke, Carl O.	Asst. Dean of Men	Univ. of Vermont
Farrell, R. Barry	Assoc. Professor	Northwestern Univ.
Faunce, L. Dale	Vice Pres., Student Services & Public Relations	Western Michigan University
Feucht, Reinhardt J.	Dean of Men	Dominican College
Finucane, Thomas F., Rev.	Dean of Stu.	Regis College
Flynn, Magnus, S.G.	Asst. Dean	Sir George Williams University
Foltman, Felician F., Dr.		U.S. Dept. of Labor
Foy, James E.	Dean of Stu. Aff.	Auburn University
Francis, Bro. J., FSC	Dean of Men	St. Mary's College
French, Arden O.	Dean of Men	Louisiana State Univ.
Fuzak, John A.	Dean of Students	Michigan State Univ.
Gaalaas, Perry E.	Dean of Men	Jamestown College
Gaines, Edwin M.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Arizona
Gambs, Charles R.	Assoc. Dean Student Relations	Ohio State University
Gentry, Robert	Asst. to Dean of Students	Elmhurst College
Gillis, John	Asst. Dean of Men	Ill. State Normal Univ.
Ginsberg, Paul	Stu. Program Adviser	Univ. of Wisconsin
Gluck, Joseph	Dir. of Stu. Aff.	W. Virginia Univ.
Good, Stuart	Dean of Stu. Aff.	Cornell College
*Goodridge, Robert C.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Redlands

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
Gould, Samuel B.	President	Educational Broad- casting Corp.
*Graham, Jack W.	Coor.Counseling & Testing Center	Southern Illinois University
Gray, Francis A., Jr.	Assoc.Dean- Student Life	Univ. of Maryland
Gray, Malcolm	President	ACUHO
Green, Paul	Asst.to V.Pres. & Div'n of Counseling Psychology	Univ. of Ill.-Chicago Amer.Psychological Assoc.
Grier, Daniel J.	Asst.Dean of Men	Purdue University
*Griffeth, Paul L	Dean of Students	Western Mich. Univ.
Griffith, Dean W.F.	Dean of Students	Colgate University
Grip, Carl	Dean of Men	Temple University
Gross, Richard	Dean of Students	Wheaton College
*Gwin, John P.	Dean of Students	Beloit College
Haack, Arno J.	Dean of Students	Washington Univ.
Hafer, John S.	Dean of Personnel Administration	Syracuse University
*Hale, Lester L.	Dean of Stu.Aff.	Univ. of Florida
Hampton, W.O.	Dean of Students	Central Missouri State
Hannigan, James P.	Dean of Students	A & M College of Texas
Hansford, Richard L.	Dean of Stu.Serv.	Univ. of Akron
Hanson, Ernest	Dean of Students	Northern Illinois Univ.
Hardee, Melvene	Past Pres.ACPA	Florida State Univ.
*Harlan, Ivan	Dean of Men	Knox College
Harris, David L.	Dean of Men	Ripon College
Harrod, Ira E.	Dean of Students	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Harvey, James	Dean of Students	Hope College
Haun, Eugene	Assoc.Dean of Stu.	Cornell University
Hawk, Ray	Dean of Men	Univ. of Oregon
Hayward, John C.	Dean of Stu.Aff.	Bucknell University
Hendrix, Noble	Dean of Students	Univ. of Miami
Hersey, Catherine A.		IAWS
Heusinkveld, Edwin D.	Dean of Men	Ferris State College
Hicks, F. W.	Asst.to the Dir. of Financial Aids	Univ. of Michigan
Hockswender, Margaret	Dean of Women	Duquesne University
Hocutt, John E.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Delaware
Hodgson, Thomas	Assoc.Dean of Stu.	Univ. of Washington
Hogan, Thomas E.	Dean of Students	Ill.Institute of Tech.
Hogg, Robert Alan	Dean of Students	Monmouth College(N.J.)
Holdeman, W. Dean	Dean of Men	Oberlin College
Hoogesteger, Howard H.	Dean of Students	Lake Forest College
Hooper, William G.	Univ.Union Dir.	Eastern Illinois Univ.
Houk, Dale W.	Dean of Students	New York University
House, S. J.	Dean of Students	Newark Col.of Engineering
Hruby, John P.	Dean of Students	Wagner College
Hubbell, Robert N.	Asst.to Assoc.Dean	Univ. of Wisconsin
Huit, Marion L.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Iowa

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
*Hulet, Richard E.	Dean of Men	Ill.State Normal U.
Hundley, George K.	Asst.to the Pres. for Student Aff.	Grand Valley State College
Ijams, Karl	Asst.Dean of Men	Univ. of Illinois
Jackson, Ronald	Dean of Students	Univ.of North Dakota
Jensen, Jay G.	Assoc.Dean for Men	Idaho State Univ.
*Johnson, Alan W.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Houston
Johnson, Dudley C., Jr.	Adviser of Men	Univ. of Akron
Johnston, Russell A.	Dean of Students	Richmond Profes- sional Institute
Kamena, Viola	Dean of Women	Univ. of Santa Clara
Kauffman, Joseph		American Council on Education
Keenan, W. Michael	Asst.Dean of Men	Univ. of Detroit
Keeseey, C. Robert	Dean of Students	Univ.of N.Hampshire
Keiser, Edward C.	Asst.Dean of Men	Univ. of Cincinnati
Kennedy, Christopher		Northeastern Univ.
Kerns, Byron L.	Dean of Students	Millikin Univ.
Kilp, Alfred, Rev.	Dean of Men	Loyola Univ. of L.A.
Kirkendall, L.A.	Dept.of Family Life & Home Admin.	Oregon State Univ.
Kissiah, Herman	Asst.Dean of Men	Wheaton College
*Kluge, Donald A.	Dean of Men & Asst.Dean of Stu.	Eastern Illinois University
Knerr, George F.	Dean of Stu.Pers.	Pace College
*Knox, Carl W.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Illinois
Koerble, C.E.	Dean of Students	Northwest Missouri State
Kollintzas, George N.	Asst.Dean of Stu.	Loyola Univ.(Chicago)
Krbec, Kirby A.	Asst.to Dean of Stu.	Univ. of Colorado
Kreuzer, James R.	Assoc.Dean of Stu.	Queens College
Kubany, Albert J.	Asst. Director, Student Relations	General Motors Institute
Lackey, John T.	Men's Counselor	Anderson College
Lacy, O. W.	Dean of Students	Trinity College
Lanier, William J.	Asst.Dean of Men	Wittenberg College
Larimer, David S.	Actg.Dean of Men	Stanford Univ.
Larson, Robert W.	Adviser of Men	Univ. of Akron
Lavin, James M.	Dean of Stu.Aff.	John Carroll Univ.
Lavin, M. Morgan		
*Lawrence, Dave	Dean of Men	Univ. of Louisville
Leathers, John	Dean of Men	Muskingum College
Lee, Juel	Asst.Dean of Men	Ripon College
Leeds, Charles	Dean of Men	MacMurray College
Leslie, Elizabeth	Assoc.Dir.of Stu. Activ.& Organizations	Univ. of Michigan
Lewis, Charles L.	Exec.Dean Student Affairs	Univ. of Tennessee
Lippincott, William	Dean of Students	Princeton University
Long, David E.	Dean of Students	MacMurray College
Long, William G.	Dean of Men	Univ. of N.C.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
Loos, Frank M.	Dean of Students	Lincoln College
Lo Schiavo, John, Rev.	Dean of Students	Univ. of San Francisco
*Loucks, Donald	Dean of Men	Florida State Univ.
*Luberg, L. E.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Wisconsin
Lucasse, Philip R.	Dean of Men	Calvin College
Lyman, Ross C.	Dir. of Financial Aids	Eastern Illinois University
MacDonald, Gilbert G.	Dean of Students	Northeastern Univ.
MacDougall, R.E.	Dean of Men	Richmond Professional Institute
Mallett, D.	V.P. & Exec. Dean	Purdue University
Manring, Tim		NSA
Marsh, J. Donald	Asst. Dean of Stu.	Wayne State Univ.
Martin, Leslie L.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Kentucky
Matthews, Alfred T.	Actg. Dean of Stu.	Washburn Univ. of Topeka
*Matthews, Jack	Dean of Students	Univ. of Missouri
*McBane, Robert A.	Dean of Students	Rider College
McCarrel, Ted	Exec. Dean-Stu. Serv.	State Univ. of Iowa
McCartan, Arthur E.	Dean of Men	Washington State
McCloskey, Harry	Dean of Students	Loyola Univ. (Chgo.)
McDonald, Keith H.	Asst. Dean of Men	Northern Ill. Univ.
McElhaney, James H.	Dir. of Stu. Aff.	New Mexico Institute of Mining & Tech.
McFadden, Jack D.	Instructor	Northwestern Univ.
McFadden, Robert		Univ. of Illinois
McFarland, Frank E.	Dean of Stu. Aff.	Oklahoma State Univ.
McGinnis, Benjamin G.	Dir. of Student Financial Aids	Kent State Univ.
McGrath, Jerald G.	Dean of Men	Univ. Santa Clara
McGroarty, Wm. K., Rev.	Dean of Students	Wheeling College
*McKean, John R.O.	Dean of Students	Allegheny College
*McLeod, James	Dean of Students	Northwestern Univ.
McMurrin, Sterling	Dept. of Philosophy	Univ. of Utah
McPadden, James J.	Dean of Men	The Catholic Univ. of America
Meese, Harold	Dean of Students	Michigan College of Mining & Technology
Meyn, Charles A.	Dean of Men	Bucknell University
Miller, Robert J.	President	College Fraternity Secretaries Ass'n.
Miller, Virgil J.	Asst. Dean of Men	Indiana State College
Millett, Barry	Asst. Dean of Men	Univ. of Maine
Miner, William D.	Asst. Dean of Stu.	Eastern Ill. Univ.
Mosher, Bryan J.	Dean of Students	State Univ. College
Murphy, George S.	Dir. of Housing Bur.	Univ. of Wisconsin
Nelson, Glenn M.	Asst. Dean of Men	Duquesne Univ.
Nester, William R.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Cincinnati
Newman, James E.	Asst. Dean of Stu.	Univ. of Chicago
Nickerson, George T.	Dean of Men	Colby College

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
Niemi, Allan	Dean of Students	Northern Michigan U.
Nonnamaker, Eldon R.	Dir., Men's Div'n	Michigan State Univ.
Northrup, Foster M.	Graduate Student	Purdue University
*Nowotny, Arno	Dean of Stu.Life	Univ. of Texas
Nygreen, Glen T.	Dean of Students	Kent State Univ.
*Oglesby, R. R.	Dean of Students	Florida State Univ.
Okoniewski, John	Dir. of Housing	State Univ. of N.Y.
Olds, Glenn A.	President	Springfield College
O'Zee, Wm. F.	Dean of Men	Colorado State U.
Paisley, James		Univ. of Colorado
Parker, Osborne B.	Coor., Stu.Develop-	Southern Illinois
	ment Programs	
*Parks, Donald S.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Toledo
Patzer, Roland D.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Vermont
Pederson, Gordon	Assoc.Dir. Men's	Elmhurst College
	Residence Halls	
Perkins, Wm., Rev.	Dean of Men	Univ. of San Francisco
Perry, Richard R.	Dir. of Admis-	The University of
	sions & Records	Toledo
Perry, W. C.	Dean of Students	Baylor University
Peters, Chester E.	Dean of Students	Kansas State Univ.
Pike, C. Milton	Dean of Students	Central Mich. Univ.
*Pillsbury, Wilbur	Dean of Students	Knox College
Playe, George	Dean of Under-	Univ. of Chicago
	graduate Students	
Pollock, O. Edward	Dean of Students	Union College
Price, Philip	Dir. of Stu.Activ.	New York Univ.
Prusok, Ralph E.	Asst.Couns.to Men	Univ. of Iowa
Puscas, Louis, Rev.	Dean of Men	Gannon College
Putzel, Max J.	Assoc.Dean of Under-	
	graduate Students	Univ. of Chicago
*Radke, Orland E.	Assoc.Dean of Stu.	Wisconsin State Coll.
Rambo, Vint	Dir. Faculty Regis-	United Presbyterian
	try Higher Ed.	USA
Ratterman, P. H., Rev.	Dean of Men	Xavier University
Rea, Bud		Univ. of Michigan
Reddoch, James W.	Dean of Stu.Serv.	Louisiana State Univ.
*Reid, J. Juan	Dean of Men	Colorado College
Renneisen, Charles	Dean of Men	St.Louis University
Reynolds, Lyle G.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Calif.-
		Santa Barbara
Reynolds, William M.	Dean of Students	The Defiance College
Rhatigan, James J.	Asst.Couns.to Men	Univ. of Iowa
Rhodes, George F.	Asst.Dean of Men	Univ. of Colorado
*Richmond, Charles H.	Dean of Students	Okla.Central State
		College
Riggs, Lawrence	Dean of Students	DePauw University
Rivet, A.L., Rev.	Dean of Students	Spring Hill College
Roberts, Hollis G.	Regional Director	College Entrance
		Examination Board
Roberts, O. D.	Dean of Men	Purdue, University

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
Robinson, David W.	Dean of Stu.Aff.	Emory University
*Robinson, Eugene E.	Assoc.Deans of Stu.	Austin College
Robinson, Ted R.	Asst.Director of Student Affairs	Iowa State Univ.
Rollins, Les	Asst. Dean	Graduate School, Bus. Admin., Harvard Univ.
Root, Reginald	Dean of Men	Univ. of Washington
Roskens, Ronald W.	Dean of Men	Kent State University
Ross, Mylin H.	Dean of Men	Ohio State University
Ross, Samuel M.	Dean of Men	W.Virginia Wesleyan College
Sales, Robert C.	Asst. Manager-Men's Residence Halls	Purdue University
*Salisch, Marc S.	Asst.Deans of Stu.	State Univ. College
Saurman, Kenneth P.	Dean of Men	DePaul University
Scanlon, Joseph	Nat'l Exec.Secy.	Alpha Phi Omega Frat.
Schleman, Helen		Purdue University
Schuiteman, Robt. A.	Dir., Foreign Student Affairs	Univ. of Illinois
Schwartz, G. R.	Dean of Students	Western Ill. Univ.
Scott, James H.	Asst.Deans of Men	Purdue University
Scully, James A.	Asst.Deans of Men & Foreign Stu.Adviser	Univ. of Cincinnati
Schmalfeld, Robert G.	Dean of Men	Heidelberg College
*Schmidt, Alvin R.	Dean of Men	Tufts University
Schwomeyer, Herbert F.	Dean of Men	Butler University
Shafer, Robert	Dean of Students	Indiana University
Sharp, Maurice J.	Dean of Students	Wayland College
*Shaw, Stanley A.	Dean of Men	Marshall University
Sheehan, Charles	Scholarship Coord., Student Affairs	W. Virginia Univ.
Shirley, Warren H.	Assoc.Deans of Stu. in charge of Men	Florida A and M University
*Shofstall, W. P.	Dean of Students	Arizona State Univ.
Shutt, D. L.	Dean of Students	Eastern N.Mex. Univ.
Sidles, Craig W.	Dean of Men	Cornell College
Siggelkow, Richard A.	Dean of Students	State Univ. of N.Y.
Simes, Frank J.	Dean of Men	Penn. State Univ.
Smith, Laurence C.	Vice Chancellor for Student Life	Texas Christian University
*Smith, J. Towner	Dean of Men	Western Mich. Univ.
Smith, Mark	Dean of Men	Denison University
*Sorrrells, Daniel J.	Dean, Div'n of Student Affairs	Univ. of Georgia
Stafford, John	Asst.Deans of Men	Ohio Wesleyan
Stalnaker, John M.	President	National Merit Scholarship Corp.
Stamatagos, Lou C.	Dean of Men	Univ. of Wisconsin
Stead, Ronald	Dean of Men	Ohio Wesleyan
*Stewart, Harold E.	Dean of Students	Wayne State Univ.
*Stewart, James J., Jr.	Dean of Stu.Aff.	N.Carolina State Col.
Stewart, John		Univ. of Maine
Stibbs, John H.	Dean of Students	Tulane University

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
Stitt, Richard S.	Deputy Director	Peace Corps
Storch, Champ R.	Asst. Dean of Men	Penn State Univ.
*Strand, David A.	Dean of Students	Southeast Missouri State College
Summerskill, John	V.P. for Stu. Aff.	Cornell University
Swank, Earle R.	Dean of Men	Carnegie Institute of Technology
Swartzbaugh, William L.	Associate Dean	Amherst College
Swift, William D.	Dean of Men	Southern Methodist University
Swords, Ray	Dir. Men's Housing	Univ. of Alabama
Szabo, Frank P.	Director of Men	Florida Southern Col.
Thompson, Jorgen S.	Dean of Men	Augustana College
Thrash, Patricia A.	Dean of Women	Northwestern Univ.
Tinkle, Wayne E.	Dean of Men	Marquette Univ.
Toll, George S.	Vice President	Coll. Fraternity Secretaries Ass'n.
Tomlin, George	Dean of Students	Univ. of S. Carolina
Toombs, William	Dean of Men	Drexel Institute
Tripp, P.A.	Division of Higher Education	Dept. of Health, Edu- cation & Welfare
Trueblood, D. L.		Southern Ill. Univ.
Truitt, John W.	Dean of Students	Indiana State Coll.
Trumpe, Richard M.	Asst. Dean of Men	Ill. State Normal U.
Tucci, Michael A.	Admin. Asst.	Wayne State Univ.
Tucker, Leslie H.	Dean of Students	Bradley University
Turner, Fred H.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Illinois
*Ukpaby, Ernest N.	Lecturer/Asst. Dean of Students	Univ. of Nigeria
*Van de Visse, Martin C.	Dir. of Student Activities	Univ. of Rochester
Venderbush, Kenneth R.	Dean of Men	Lawrence College
*Voldseth, Edward	Dean of Students	Univ. of Alaska
*Wallace, Jewell	Dean of Men	Texas Christian Univ.
Walle, Richard Vern	Dean of Men	Champlain College
Wallenfeldt, E. C.	Counselor to Men	Univ. of Iowa
Watkins, James V.	Asst. to Director Student Affairs	W. Virginia Univ.
Watson, George H.	Dean of Students	Roosevelt Univ.
Webster, E. Douglas	Dean of Students	Utica College of Syracuse University
Weinstein, Esther G.	Asst. Dean of Stu.	Shimer College
Wells, Bruce G.	Placement Officer & Asst. to the Dean of Men	Univ. of Western Ontario
Whalen, Jerome P.	Asst. Dean of Men	Univ. of Pittsburgh
Whelan, T. P.	Dean of Men	Nebraska State Coll.
Whitehair, Jay	Asst. to Dean	Dartmouth College
Wick, Warner A.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Chicago
Wild, Payson S.	V.P. & Dean of Faculties	Northwestern Univ.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>
Wilkinson, James R.	Dean of Men	Alabama College
Williams, Arleigh	Dean of Men	Univ. of California
Williams, Thomas G.	Dean of Men	Coe College
Williamson, Edmund	Dean of Students	Univ. of Minnesota
Wilson, Gerald	Asst.to the Dean of Men	Duke University
Winbigler, H. Donald	Dean of Students	Stanford University
Wingett, Roger A.	Dean of Men	Adelphi College
Wittich, John H.	Executive Dir.	Western Personnel Institute
Wolff, Alfred R.	Dean of Stu.Pers.	Univ. of Bridgeport
Womble, Hilburn	Asst.Dean of Men	Duke University
*Wood, C. W.	Dir.Stu.Personnel	Univ. of Minnesota
Woodruff, Laurence C.	Dean of Students	Univ. of Kansas
*Wright, Ralph W.	Dean of Men	Kansas State College of Pittsburg
Wright, William McK.	Assoc.Dean of Stu.	DePauw University
Wunderlich, Herbert J.	Dean of Students	Unif.of South Florida
*Wygles, R. W.	Dir. of Student Personnel Services	Kansas State Teachers College
Yanitelli, Victor R. Rev.	Vice President	Fordham University
Yaros, Edward J.	Asst.Dean of Stu.	Newark College of Engineering
Yoke, Robert S.	Director of Student Relations	General Motors Institute
*Young, Ralph A.	Dean of Men	The College of Wooster
Zerman, W.S.	Exec. Secretary	Phi Gamma Delta
Zillman, Ted	Dean of Men	Univ. of Wisconsin

* Denotes wife or husband in attendance.

APPENDIX D

ROSTER OF MEMBERS June 15, 1963

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Location</u>
Adrian College		Adrian, Michigan
A. & M. College of Texas	James Hannigan	College Station, Texas
Akron, Univ. of	Richard L. Hansford	Akron 4, Ohio
Alabama College	James Wilkinson	Montevallo, Ala.
Alabama, Univ. of	John Blackburn	University, Ala.
Alameda County State College		Hayward, Calif.
Alaska, Univ. of	Edward Voldseth	College, Alaska
Albion College		Albion, Michigan
Alfred University	Paul F. Powers	Alfred, New York
Allegheny College	John McKean	Meadville, Pa.
Alma College	John Kimball	Alma, Michigan
American International College	Charles R. Gadaire	Springfield, Mass.
American University	Charles W. Van Way, Jr.	Washington, D.C.
Anderson College	Norman Beard	Anderson, Indiana
Andrews University	J. W. Cassell, Jr.	Berrien Springs, Michigan
Arizona State Univ.	W. P. Shofstall	Tempe, Arizona
Arizona, University of	A. Louis Slonaker	Tucson, Arizona
Arkansas State College	Robert Moore	State College, Ark.
Arkansas, Univ. of	D. Whitney Halladay	Fayetteville, Ark.
Ashland College	George M. Guiley	Ashland, Ohio
Atlantic Christian Col.		Wilson, North Car.
Auburn University	James E. Foy	Auburn, Alabama
Augsburg College	Peter H. Armacost	Minneapolis, Minn.
Augustana College	Jorgen S. Thompson	Sioux Falls, S.Dak.
Baker University	Benjamin A. Gessner	Baldwin, Kansas
Baldwin-Wallace Col.	Robert W. Pitcher	Berea, Ohio
Ball State Teachers College	Merrill C. Beyerl	Muncie, Indiana
Baylor University	Monroe S. Carroll	Waco, Texas
Beloit College	John P. Gwin	Beloit, Wisconsin
Berea College	James Orwig	Berea, Kentucky
Bethany College	R. Monroe Sellers	Bethany, West Va.
Boston College	Francis B. McManus, S. J.	Boston, Mass.
Boston University	Staton Curtis	Boston, Mass.
Bowling Green State University	Donnall U. Smith	Bowling Green, Ohio
Bradley University	Leslie H. Tucker	Peoria, Illinois
Brandeis University	Morton Tenzer	Waltham, Mass.
Brigham Young Univ.	Anton K. Ronney	Provo, Utah
Brooklyn Center, Long Island University	John W. Hickey	Brooklyn 1, New York

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Location</u>
Brown University	Robert E. Hill	Providence, R. I.
Bucknell University	John Hayward	Lewisburg, Pa.
Buffalo, The Univ. of	Richard A. Siggelkow	Buffalo, New York
Butler University	Herbert Schwomeyer	Indianapolis, Ind.
Calif. Institute of Technology	Paul C. Eaton	Pasadena, Calif.
California State Polytechnic College		San Luis Obispo, California
California, Univ. of	Katherine Towle	Berkeley, Calif.
California, Univ. of	William C. Weir	Davis, California
California, Univ. of	Byron Atkinson	Los Angeles, Calif.
California, Univ. of	Thomas L. Broadbent	Riverside, Calif.
(Medical Center)		San Francisco, California
California, Univ. of (Santa Barbara College)	Lyle G. Reynolds	Goleta, Calif.
Calif. Western Univ.	William E. Clarke	San Diego, Calif.
Calvin College	Philip R. Lucasse	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Canisius College	Edward B. Gillen	Buffalo, New York
Capital University	John Kirker	Columbus, Ohio
Carleton College	Merrill E. Jarchow	Northfield, Minn.
Carnegie Institute of Technology	George Brown	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Carroll College	Robert E. Matson	Waukesha, Wis.
Carroll University, John	James M. Lavin	Cleveland, Ohio
Carthage College		Carthage, Illinois
Case Institute of Technology	Thomas E. Baker	Cleveland, Ohio
Catholic University of America, The	James J. McPadden	Washington, D. C.
Central Michigan Univ.	C. Milton Pike	Mt. Pleasant, Mich.
Central Missouri State College	W. O. Hampton	Warrensburg, Mo.
Central State College	Charles H. Richmond	Edmond, Oklahoma
Chicago, Univ. of	Warner A. Wick	Chicago, Ill.
	George Playe	
Chico State College	John L. Bergstresser	Chico, Calif.
Cincinnati, Univ. of	William Nestor	Cincinnati, Ohio
City College of N.Y.	Willard W. Blaesser	New York, N.Y.
Clarion State College	Carrell F. Rishel	Clarion, Pa.
Clarkson College of Technology	F. Gordon Lindsey	Potsdam, New York
Coe College	Thomas G. Williams	Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Colby College	George T. Nickerson	Waterville, Maine
Colgate University	Wm. F. Griffith	Hamilton, N.Y.
Coll. of the Holy Cross	Charles J. Dunn, S.J.	Worcester, Mass.
Colorado College	Juan Reid	Colo. Springs, Colo.
Colorado School of Mines	W. V. Burger	Golden, Colorado
Colorado State Univ.	Burns B. Crookston	Ft. Collins, Colo.
Colorado, Univ. of		Boulder, Colorado
Columbia, College of Columbia University	John W. Alexander	New York, New York

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Location</u>
Concordia Teachers College	Carl Halter	River Forest, Illinois
Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science & Art	Richard S. Ball	Cooper Square, New York, N.Y.
Cornell College	Stuart J.E. Good	Mt. Vernon, Iowa
Cornell University	John Summerskill	Ithaca, New York
Creighton University	Austin E. Miller, S.J.	Omaha, Nebraska
Culver-Stockton College	H. Dale Almond	Canton, Mo.
Dartmouth College	Thaddeus Seymour	Hanover, N. H.
Dayton, Univ. of	George B. Barrett, S.M.	Dayton, Ohio
Defiance College, The	William Reynolds	Defiance, Ohio
Delaware, Univ. of	John E. Hocutt	Newark, Delaware
Denison University	Mark W. Smith	Granville, Ohio
Denver, University of	Dirk Brown	Denver, Colorado
DePaul University	T.J. Wangler, C.M.	Chicago, Ill.
Depauw University	Lawrence A. Riggs	Greencastle, Ind.
Detroit, Univ. of	Thomas A. Emmet	Detroit, Mich.
Dickinson College	Alan Coutts	Carlisle, Pa.
Doane College	James Campbell	Crete, Nebraska
Dominican College	R. J. Feucht	Racine, Wisconsin
Drake University	Paul A. Bloland	Des Moines, Iowa
Drexel Institute of Tech.	William E. Toombs	Philadelphia, Pa.
Drury College		Springfield, Mo.
Duke University	Robert B. Cox	Durham, N. Car.
Duquesne University	J.F. McNamara, S.J.	Pittsburgh, Pa.
East Texas State Teachers College	J. W. Rollins	Commerce, Texas
Eastern Michigan Coll.	Ralph F. Gilden	Ypsilanti, Mich.
Eastern New Mexico Univ.	Darold Shutt	Portales, N. Mex.
Eastern Washington State College	Daryl Hagie	Cheney, Washington
Elmhurst College	William F. Denman	Elmhurst, Ill.
Emory University	David W. Robinson	Emory Univ., Ga.
Emory & Henry College	J. Gordon Brown	Emory, Virginia
Evansville College	Robt. V. Thompson	Evansville, Ind.
Fairleigh Dickinson Univ.	Clair W. Black	Rutherford, N.J.
Ferris State College	Donald F. Rankin	Big Rapids, Mich.
Fisk University	William T. Green	Nashville, Tenn.
Florida A. & M. Univ.	Warren Shirley	Tallahassee, Fla.
Florida Southern Coll.	Philip R. Campbell	Lakeland, Florida
Florida State Univ.	R. R. Oglesby	Tallahassee, Fla.
Florida, Univ. of	Lester Hale	Gainesville, Fla.
Fordham University		New York, New York
Fort Hayes Kansas State College	Bill Jellison	Hays, Kansas
Franklin & Marshall College	Hadley S. DePuy	Lancaster, Pa.
Fresno State College	Donald Albright	Fresno, Calif.
Gannon College	Louis Puscas	Erie, Pa.
General Motors Institute	Robert S. Yoke	Flint, Michigan

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Location</u>
George Washington Univ.	Donald Faith	Washington, D.C.
Georgetown University	Arthur E. Gordon, S.J.	Washington, D.C.
Georgia Inst. of Tech.	George C. Griffin	Atlanta, Georgia
Georgia State College of Business Admin.	Kenneth England	Atlanta, Georgia
Georgia, Univ. of	Daniel J. Sorrells	Athens, Georgia
Gettysburg College	John W. Shainline	Gettysburg, Pa.
Gonzaga University	Daniel Lyons, S.J.	Spokane, Wash.
Grinnell College	Stephen Wood	Grinnell, Iowa
Grove City College	Robert D. McKay	Grove City, Pa.
Hamilton College	Sidney Wertimer, Jr.	Clinton, New York
Hanover College	Glen L. Bonsett	Hanover, Indiana
Harvard University	John U. Munro	Cambridge, Mass.
Hastings College	Orin R. Stratton	Hastings, Nebr.
Hawaii, Univ. of	Harold Bitner	Honolulu, Hawaii
Heidelberg College	Robert G. Schmalfeld	Tiffin, Ohio
Henderson State Teachers College		Arkadelphia, Arkansas
Hillsdale College	Robert Hendee	Hillsdale, Mich.
Hiram College	Charles Thompson	Hiram, Ohio
Hofstra University	Randall W. Hoffman	Hempstead, N.Y.
Hope College	James Harvey	Holland, Michigan
Houston, Univ. of	Alan W. Johnson	Houston, Texas
Howard University	A. J. Blackburn	Washington, D.C.
Humboldt State College	Don W. Karshner	Arcata, Calif.
Idaho State College	Mel F. Schubert	Pocatello, Idaho
Idaho, University of	Chas. O. Decker	Moscow, Idaho
Ill. Institute of Tech.	Thomas E. Hogan	Chicago, Illinois
Ill. State Normal Univ.	B. E. Hulet	Normal, Illinois
Univ. of Illinois Professional	Maurice Galbraith	Chicago, Illinois
Illinois, Univ. of	Warren O. Brown	Chicago, Illinois
Illinois, Univ. of	Fred H. Turner Carl W. Knox	Urbana, Illinois
Illinois Wesleyan Univ.	T. J. Diener	Bloomington, Ill.
Indiana State College	John W. Truitt	Terre Haute, Ind.
Indiana State College	S. Trevor Hadley	Indiana, Penna.
Indiana University	Robert H. Shaffer	Bloomington, Ind.
Interamerican Univ. of Puerto Rico	Luis Sambolin	Mayaguez, Puerto Rico
Iowa State College	Millard R. Kratochvil	Ames, Iowa
Iowa, State Univ. of	Marion L. Huit	Iowa City, Iowa
Kansas City, Univ. of	Wheadon Bloch	Kansas City, Mo.
Kansas State College	Chester E. Peters	Manhattan, Kansas
Kansas State Teachers College	Victor T. Trusler	Emporia, Kansas
Kansas State College of Pittsburg	Ralph Wright	Pittsburg, Kansas
Kansas, Univ. of	Laurence C. Woodruff	Lawrence, Kansas
Kansas Wesleyan Univ.	John F. Courter	Salina, Kansas
Kent State University		Kent, Ohio
Kentucky, Univ. of	Leslie L. Martin	Lexington, Ky.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Location</u>
Kenyon College	Thomas J. Edwards	Gambier, Ohio
Knox College	Wilbur F. Pillsbury	Galesburg, Ill.
Lafayette College		Easton, Pa.
Lake Forest College	Howard Hoogesteger	Lake Forest, Ill.
Lamar State College of Technology	D. L. Bost	Beaumont, Texas
Lawrence College	Ken Venderbush	Appleton, Wis.
Lehigh University	J. D. Leith	Bethlehem, Pa.
LeMoyne College	Robert E. Butler, S. J.	LeMoyne Heights Syracuse, N.Y.
Lenoir Rhyne College	Frank H. Bretz	Hickory, N. Car.
Lewis & Clark College	Vergel Fogdall	Portland, Oregon
Long Beach State Coll.	Karl A. Russell, Jr.	Long Beach, Calif.
Long Island Univ., C.W. Post College of	Fred S. DeMarr	Greenvale, New York
Loras College	Eugene C. Kutsch	Dubuque, Iowa
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute	S. X. Lewis	Ruston, Louisiana
Louisiana State Univ.	Arden O. French	Baton Rouge, La.
Louisville, Univ. of	Dave Lawrence	Louisville, Ky.
Loyola College	Frank C. Bourbon, S.J.	Baltimore, Md.
Loyola Univ. of Chicago	H. McCloskey	Chicago, Ill.
Loyola Univ. of Los Angeles	Alfred J. Kilp, S.J.	Los Angeles, California
Loyola Univ. of New Orleans	Robert L. Boggs, S.J.	New Orleans, La.
Lycoming College	Jack C. Buckle	Williamsport, Pa.
MacMurray College	David E. Long	Jacksonville, Ill.
Maine, Univ. of	John E. Stewart	Orono, Maine
Malone College		Canton, Ohio
Manhattan College	George T. Eastment	New York, N.Y.
Mankato State College	Norbert K. Baumgart	Mankato, Minn.
Maritime College	Arthur J. Spring	Ft. Schuyler, New York, N.Y.
Marquette University	F. L. Stanton, S.J.	Milwaukee, Wis.
Marshall University	Stanley Shaw	Huntington, W. Va.
Maryland, Univ. of	B. James Borreson	College Park, Md.
Mass. Institute of Tech.		Cambridge, Mass.
Massachusetts, Univ. of	William F. Field	Amherst, Mass.
McNeese State College	Ellis Guillory	Lake Charles, La.
Mercer University		Macon, Georgia
Miami University	Robert Etheridge	Oxford, Ohio
Miami, Univ. of	Noble Hendrix Ben David	Coral Gables, Florida
Michigan College of Mining & Technology	Harold Meese	Houghton, Mich.
Michigan State Univ.	Jack Fuzak	E. Lansing, Mich.
Michigan, Univ. of	James A. Lewis W. B. Rea	Ann Arbor, Mich.
Middlebury College	Ronald D. Pontier	Middlebury, Vt.
Midwestern University		Wichita Falls, Tex.
Millikin University	Byron L. Kerns	Decatur, Illinois

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Location</u>
Minnesota, Univ. of	E. G. Williamson	Minneapolis, Minn.
Minnesota, Univ. of (Duluth Branch)	C. W. Wood	Duluth, Minn.
Mississippi College	Charles W. Scott	Clinton, Miss.
Mississippi, Univ. of	L. L. Love	University, Miss.
Miss. Southern College	J. R. Switzer	Hattiesburg, Miss.
Missouri, Univ. of	Jack Matthews	Columbia, Missouri
Monmouth College	Elwood H. Ball	Monmouth, Ill.
Monmouth College	Robert A. Hogg	W. Long Beach, N.J.
Montana State College	Val Glynn	Bozeman, Montana
Montana State Univ.	Andrew Cogswell	Missoula, Mont.
Montclair State	Leo G. Fuchs	Montclair, New Jersey
Teachers College		
Moravian College	James J. Heller	Bethlehem, Pa.
Morris Harvey College	Frank J. Krebs	Charleston, W. Va.
Muhlenberg College	Claude Dierolf	Allentown, Pa.
Muskingum College	John Leathers	New Concord, Ohio
Nassor College	Robert D. Witherill	Springvale, Maine
Nebraska, Univ. of	G. Robert Ross	Lincoln, Nebr.
Nebr. Wesleyan Univ.	Delbert J. Sampson	Lincoln, Nebr.
Nevada, Univ. of	Sam Basta	Reno, Nevada
Newark College of Engineering	S. J. House	Newark, New Jersey
New Hampshire, Univ. of	C. Robert Keesey	Durham, N.H.
New Mexico State Univ.	Philip S. Ambrose	University Park, New Mexico
New Mexico Highlands University	Ray A. Farmer	Las Vegas, New Mexico
New Mexico, Univ. of	Howard V. Mathany	Albuquerque, N.M.
New York University	Philip Price	New York, N.Y.
North Carolina State Col.	James J. Stewart, Jr.	Raleigh, N. Car.
North Carolina, Univ. of	Charles Henderson	Chapel Hill, N.C.
North Dakota State Univ.	C. A. Sevrinson	Fargo, North Dak.
North Dakota, Univ. of	Ronald Jackson	Grand Forks, N.D.
Northeast Louisiana State College	Fred J. Vogel	Monroe, Louisiana
Northeastern Univ.	Gilbert MacDonald	Boston, Mass.
Northern Illinois Univ.	Ernest E. Hanson	DeKalb, Illinois
Northern Mich. College	Allan L. Niemi	Marquette, Mich.
Northern Montana Coll.	John W. Stair	Havre, Montana
Northwestern State Coll.	Richard B. Caple	Alva, Oklahoma
Northwestern University	James C. McLeod	Evanston, Ill.
Northwest Missouri State College	C. E. Koerble	Maryville, Mo.
Northwestern State Col.	Dudley G. Fulton	Natchitoches, La.
Univ. of Notre Dame	Charles McCarragher, CSC	Notre Dame, Ind.
Oberlin College	W. Dean Holdeman	Oberlin, Ohio
Occidental College	Robert S. RYF	Los Angeles, Cal.
Ohio State Univ.	John T. Bonner, Jr. Mylin H. Ross	Columbus, Ohio
Ohio University	William Butler	Athens, Ohio
Ohio Wesleyan Univ.	Ron Stead	Delaware, Ohio
Oklahoma State Univ.	F. E. McFarland	Stillwater, Okla.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Location</u>
Oklahoma Baptist Univ.	Donald G. Osborn	Shawnee, Okla.
Oklahoma City Univ.	Robert Jones	Oklahoma City, Okla.
Oklahoma, Univ. of	Clifford J. Craven	Norman, Oklahoma
Omaha, Univ. of	Don J. Pflasterer	Omaha, Nebraska
Oregon State College	Robert Chick	Corvallis, Oregon
	Dan Poling	
Oregon, Univ. of	Donald M. DuShane	Eugene, Oregon
Ottawa, Univ. of	Rev. Father Leonard Ducharme	Ottawa, Canada
Face College	George F. Knerr	New York, N.Y.
Pacific, Univ. of the	Edward S. Betz	Stockton, Calif.
Pacific, Univ. of	C. Bryce Dunham	Forest Grove, Ore.
Pennsylvania State Univ.	Frank Simes	Univ. Park, Pa.
Pennsylvania, Univ. of	Robert F. Longley	Philadelphia, Pa.
Pittsburgh, Univ. of	William B. Crafts	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn	Henry Q. Middendorf	Brooklyn, N.Y.
Polytechnic Institute of Puerto Rico	Boyd B. Palmer	San German, Puerto Rico
Pomona College	Shelton L. Beatty	Claremont, Calif.
Portland State College	Channing Briggs	Portland, Oregon
Pratt Institute	Louis Robineau	Brooklyn, N.Y.
Princeton University	William Lippincott	Princeton, N.J.
Principia, The	Allen C. Brooks	Elsah, Illinois
Purdue University	O. D. Roberts	Lafayette, Ind.
Queens College	James R. Krenzer	Flushing, N.Y.
Redlands, Univ. of	Robert C. Goodridge	Redlands, Calif.
Regis College	Rev. Thomas F. Finucane	Denver, Colo.
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	Ira Harrod	Troy, New York
Rhode Island, Univ. of	John F. Quinn	Kingston, R.I.
Rice Institute		Houston, Texas
Richmond, Univ. of	C. J. Gray	Richmond, Va.
Richmond Professional Institute (College of William & Mary)	Richard E. MacDougall	Richmond, Virginia
Rider College	Robert A. McBane	Trenton, N.J.
Ripon College	David L. Harris	Ripon, Wisconsin
Roanoke College	Donald M. Sutton	Salem, Virginia
Rochester Inst. of Tech.	Melvyn Rinfret	Rochester, N.Y.
Rochester, Univ. of	Joseph Cole	Rochester, N.Y.
Rockford College, The	Stanley J. Gross	Rockford, Ill.
Rollins College	D. W. Vermilye	Winter Park, Fla.
Roosevelt Univ.	Arthur E. Hoover	Chicago, Ill.
Rutgers University	Earle W. Clifford	New Brunswick, New Jersey
Sacramento State Coll.	Donald Bailey	Sacramento, Calif.
Saint Mary's College	Brother J. Francis, FSC	Winona, Minnesota
St. Cloud State College	Robert G. Tomwinkle	St. Cloud, Minn.
St. Lawrence University		Canton, New York
Saint Louis University	M. B. Martin, S.J.	St. Louis, Mo.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Location</u>
St. Mary's University	Bro. Henry Ringkamp, S.M.	San Antonio, Tex.
St. Olaf College	Mark Alml1	Northfield, Minn.
St. Peter's College	Victor R. Yanitelli, S.J.	Jersey City, New Jersey
St. Procopius College	Valentine Skluzacek, O.S.B.	Lisle, Illinois
San Diego State Coll.	Herbert C. Peiffer, Jr.	San Diego, Calif.
San Fernando Valley State College	John T. Palmer	Northridge, California
San Francisco State Col.	Ferd Reddell	San Francisco, Cal.
San Francisco, Univ. of	Wm. B. Perkins	San Francisco, Cal.
San Jose State College	Stanley Benz	San Jose, Calif.
Santa Clara, Univ. of	Jerald McGrath	Santa Clara, Cal.
Scranton, Univ. of	Joseph P. Vetz, S.J.	Scranton, Pa.
Shepherd College	Ormsby L. Harry	Shepherdstown, W. Va.
Shimer College	Curtis Larson	Mt. Carroll, Ill.
Shippensburg State Col.		Shippensburg, Pa.
Simpson College	Joseph W. Walt	Indianola, Iowa
Slippery Rock State Col.		Slippery Rock, Pa.
South Carolina, Univ. of	Chas. H. Witten	Columbia, S.C.
South Dakota, State University of	Howard Connors	Vermillion, S.D.
Southeast Missouri State College	David A. Strand	Cape Girardeau, Missouri
Southeastern Louisiana College	L. E. Chandler	Hammond, La.
Southern Calif., Univ. of	Robert J. Downey	Los Angeles, Cal.
Southern Connecticut State College	Roy R. Senour, Jr.	New Haven, Conn.
Southern Illinois Univ.	I. Clark Davis	Carbondale, Ill.
Southern Illinois Univ.	Howard Davis	Alton, Illinois
Southern Methodist Univ.	Mayne Longnecker	Dallas, Texas
Southwestern College	Donald L. Colburn	Winfield, Kansas
Southwestern Louisiana, University of	E. Glynn Abel	Lafayette, La.
Springfield College	R. William Cheney	Springfield, Mass.
Spring Hill College	Hilton Rivet, S.J.	Spring Hill, Ala.
Stanford University	H. Donald Winbigler	Stanford, Calif.
State Teachers Col.	Samuel M. Long	Mansfield, Pa.
State Univ. of New York L.I. Center	David C. Tilly	Oyster Bay, New York
State University Teachers College	Charles Lamorte	Buffalo, N.Y.
State University Teachers College		Cortland, N.Y.
State University Teachers College	Gerald Saddleire	Geneseo, N.Y.
State Univ. of New York Teachers College	Norman E. Whitten	Oswego, N.Y.
Stetson Univ., John B.	George W. Hood	DeLand, Florida
Steubenville, Coll. of	Dennis Sullivan, T.O.R.	Steubenville, Ohio

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Location</u>
Stevens Institute of Technology	Charles Weelhausen	Hoboken, N.J.
Syracuse University	John S. Hafer	Syracuse, N.Y.
Taylor University	Henry Nelson	Upland, Indiana
Temple University	Carl M. Grip	Philadelphia, Pa.
Tennessee, Univ. of	R. E. Dunford	Knoxville, Tenn.
Tenn. Wesleyan College	Floyd Bowling	Athens, Tenn.
Texas Christian Univ.	Laurence C. Smith	Fort Worth, Texas
Texas College of Arts and Industries	J. E. Turner	Kingsville, Texas
Texas Technological Col.	James G. Allen	Lubbock, Texas
Texas, University of	Arno Nowotny	Austin, Texas
Thiel College	J. B. Stoeber	Greenville, Pa.
Toledo, Univ. of	Donald S. Parks	Toledo, Ohio
Trenton State College	Charles W. McCracken	Trenton, N.J.
Trinity College	O. W. Lacy	Hartford, Conn.
Troy State College	Lewis Godlove	Troy, Alabama
Tufts University	Clifton W. Emery	Medford, Mass.
Tulane University	John H. Stibbs	New Orleans, La.
Tulsa, University of	Harry Carter	Tulsa, Oklahoma
Union College	Robert L. Britain	Lincoln, Nebr.
Union College	Edward Pollock	Schenectady, N.Y.
Universite Laval	Jean-Charles Bouffard	Quebec, Canada
Univ. of Bridgeport	Alfred R. Wolff	Bridgeport, Conn.
Upsala College	Harold S. Carlson	E. Orange, N.J.
Utah State Agric. Coll.	J. Elliot Cameron	Logan, Utah
Utah, Univ. of	Neal A. Maxwell	Salt Lake City, Utah
Valparaiso University	Luther Koepke	Valparaiso, Ind.
Vanderbilt University		Nashville, Tenn.
Vermont, Univ. of	Roland D. Patzer	Burlington, Vt.
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	James W. Dean	Blacksburg, Va.
Virginia, Univ. of	B.F.D. Runk	Charlottesville, Virginia
Wabash College	Norman C. Moore	Crawfordsville, Indiana
Wagner College	John Hruby	Staten Island, N.Y.
Washburn Univ. of Topeka		Topeka, Kansas
Washington & Lee Univ.	Edward C. Atwood, Jr.	Lexington, Va.
Washington College	Warren Brewer, Jr.	Chestertown, Md.
Washington State Univ.	J. C. Clevenger	Pullman, Wash.
Washington University	Arno Haack	St. Louis, Mo.
Washington, Univ. of	Donald K. Anderson	Seattle, Wash.
Wayland Baptist College	Maurice J. Sharp	Plainview, Texas
Wayne State Univ.	Harold Stewart	Detroit, Mich.
Western Illinois Univ.	Gary Schwartz	Macomb, Ill.
Western Maryland Coll.	William M. David, Jr.	Westminster, Md.
Western Michigan Univ.	Paul L. Griffith	Kalamazoo, Mich.
	J. Towner Smith	
Western Reserve Univ.	Russell A. Griffin	Cleveland, Ohio
Western Washington State College	M. S. Kuder	Bellingham, Wash.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Location</u>
Westminster College	John E. Marshall	Fulton, Mo.
W.Virginia Institute of Technology	Neil Baisi	Montgomery, W.Va.
West Virginia Univ.	Joseph C. Gluck	Morgantown, W.Va.
Wheaton College	Dick Gross	Wheaton, Ill.
Wheeling College	William K. McGroarty, S.J.	Wheeling, W. Va.
Wichita, Univ. of		Wichita, Kansas
William & Mary, Coll.of	Carson Barnes, Jr.	Williamsburg, Va.
Wilmington College		Wilmington, Ohio
Wisconsin State College	James H. Albertson	Stevens Point, Wis.
Wisconsin, Univ. of	Theodore W. Zillman	Madison, Wisconsin
Wisconsin, Univ. of	L. C. Stamatakis	Milwaukee, Wis.
Wittenberg University	Robert Long	Springfield, Ohio
Wooster, College of	Ralph A. Young	Wooster, Ohio
Wyoming, Univ. of	R. E. Kinder	Laramie, Wyoming
Xavier University	P.H. Ratterman, S.J.	Cincinnati, Ohio

APPENDIX E

SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Meet- ing	Year	Pres- ent	Place	President	Secretary
1	1919	6	Madison, Wisconsin	S.H. Goodnight	L.A. Strauss
2	1920	9	Urbana, Illinois	T.A. Clark	S.H. Goodnight
3	1921	16	Iowa City, Iowa	T.A. Clark	S.H. Goodnight
4	1922	20	Lexington, Ky.	E.E. Nicholson	S.H. Goodnight
5	1923	17	Lafayette, Ind.	Stanley Coulter	E.E. Nicholson
6	1924	29	Ann Arbor, Mich.	J.A. Bursley	E.E. Nicholson
7	1925	31	Chapel Hill, N.C.	Robert Rienow	F.F. Bradshaw
8	1926	46	Minneapolis, Minn.	C.R. Melcher	F.F. Bradshaw
9	1927	43	Atlanta, Georgia	Floyd Field	F.F. Bradshaw
10	1928	50	Boulder, Colorado	S.H. Goodnight	F.M. Dawson
11	1929	75	Washington, D.C.	C.B. Culver	V.I. Moore
12	1930	64	Fayetteville, Ark.	J.W. Armstrong	V.I. Moore
13	1931	83	Knoxville, Tenn.	W.J. Sanders	V.I. Moore
14	1932	40	Los Angeles, Calif.	V.I. Moore	D.H. Gardner
15	1933	55	Columbus, Ohio	C.E. Edmondson	D.H. Gardner
16	1934	61	Evanston, Ill.	H.E. Lobdell	D.H. Gardner
17	1935	56	Baton Rouge, La.	B.A. Tolbert	D.H. Gardner
18	1936	92	Philadelphia, Pa.	W.E. Alderman	D.H. Gardner
19	1937	80	Austin, Texas	D.S. Lancaster	D.H. Gardner
20	1938	164	Madison, Wisconsin	D.H. Gardner	F.H. Turner
21	1939	87	Roanoke, Virginia	D.H. Gardner	F.H. Turner
22	1940	58	Albuquerque, N.Mex.	F.J. Findlay	F.H. Turner
23	1941	100	Cincinnati, Ohio	J.J. Thompson	F.H. Turner
24	1942	114	Urbana, Illinois	L.S. Corbett	F.H. Turner
25	1943	101	Columbus, Ohio	J.A. Park	F.H. Turner
26	1944	96	Chicago, Illinois	J.H. Julian	F.H. Turner
27	1945	Due to	Office of Defense Transportation	No Meeting Held	
28	1946	142	Lafayette, Indiana	Earl J. Miller	F.H. Turner
29	1947	170	Ann Arbor, Mich.	Arno Nowotny	F.H. Turner
30	1948	173	Dallas, Texas	E.L. Cloyd	F.H. Turner
31	1949	217	Highland Park, Ill.	J.H. Newman	F.H. Turner
32	1950	210	Williamsburg, Va.	L.K. Neidlinger	F.H. Turner
33	1951	222	St. Louis, Mo.	W.P. Lloyd	F.H. Turner
34	1952	180	Colorado Springs, Colo.	A. Blair Knapp	F.H. Turner
35	1953	245	East Lansing, Mich.	V.F. Spathelf	F.H. Turner
36	1954	231	Roanoke, Virginia	R.M. Strozier	F.H. Turner
37	1955	230	Lafayette, Ind.	J.H. Stibbs	F.H. Turner
38	1956	201	Berkeley, Calif.	J.E. Hocutt	F.H. Turner
39	1957	231	Durham, N. Carolina	F.C. Baldwin	F.H. Turner
40	1958	306	French Lick, Ind.	D.M. Du Shane	F.H. Turner
41	1959	303	Boston, Mass.	F.H. Turner	C.W. Knox
42	1960	367	Columbus, Ohio	H.D. Winbigler	C.W. Knox
43	1961	303	Colorado Springs, Colo.	W.S. Guthrie	C.W. Knox
44	1962	408	Philadelphia, Pa.	F.H. Weaver	C.W. Knox
45	1963	383	Evanston, Ill.	J.C. Clevenger	C.W. Knox

RECEIVED

AUG 17 1963

Office of the Dean of Students